



# **AMERICAN LUTHERANISM**

**By F. BENTE**

## **VOLUME I**







CONCORDIA SERIES  
OF  
MODERN LITERATURE  
THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS



# American Lutheranism

VOLUME I

—\*—

## Early History of American Lutheranism

and

## The Tennessee Synod

By

F. BENTE



ST. LOUIS, Mo.  
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE  
1919

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON  
UNIVERSITY  
1942 1941  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



## PREFACE.

---

Essentially, *Christianity* is the special divine faith in the truth revealed by the Bible that we are saved, not by our own efforts, works, or merits, but alone by the pure and unmerited grace of God, secured by Christ Jesus and freely offered in the Gospel. And the Christian Church is the sum total of all those who truly believe, and therefore confess and propagate this truth of the Gospel.

Accordingly, the *history* of Christianity and of the Christian Church is essentially the record concerning this truth, *viz.*, how, when, where, by whom, with what success and consistency, etc., it has been proclaimed, received, rejected, opposed, defended, corrupted, and restored again to its original purity.

*Lutheranism* is not Christianity *plus* several ideas or modifications of ideas added by Luther, but simply Christianity, consistent Christianity, neither more nor less. And the Lutheran Church is not a new growth, but merely the restoration of the original Christian Church with its apostolic, pure confession of the only saving Christian truth and faith.

The *history* of Lutheranism and of the Lutheran Church, therefore, is essentially the story concerning the old Christian truth, restored by Luther, *viz.*, how, by whom, where, when, etc., this truth was promulgated, embraced, rejected, condemned, defended, corrupted, and restored again to pristine purity.

As for *American Lutheranism*, it is not a specific brand of Lutheranism, but simply Lutheranism in America; for doctrinally Lutheranism, like Christianity, with which it is identical, is the same the world over.

Neither is the American Lutheran Church a distinct species or variety of the Lutheran Church, but merely the Lutheran Church in America.

The *modified* Lutheranism advocated during the middle of the nineteenth century as "American Lutheranism" was a misnomer, for in reality it was neither American nor Lutheran, but a sectarian corruption of both.

Hence, also, the *history* of American Lutheranism is but the record of how the Christian truth, restored by Luther, was preached and accepted, opposed and defended, corrupted and restored, in our country, at various times, by various men, in various synods and congregations.

In the history of American Lutheranism *four names* are of special significance: Muhlenberg, Schmucker, Walther, Krauth.

H. M. Muhlenberg endeavored to transplant to America the modified Lutheranism of the Halle Pietists. S. S. Schmucker's ambition was to transmogrify the Lutheran Church into an essentially unionistic Reformed body. C. F. Walther labored most earnestly and consistently to purge American Lutheranism of its foreign elements, and to restore the American Lutheran Church to its original purity, in doctrine as well as in practise. In a similar spirit Charles Porterfield Krauth devoted his efforts to revive confessional Lutheranism within the English portion of our Church.

The *first volume* of our presentation of American Lutheranism deals with the early history of Lutheranism in America. The second, which appeared first, presents the history of the synods which in 1918 merged into the United Lutheran Church: the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South. The third deals with the history of the Ohio, Iowa, Buffalo, and the Scandinavian synods, and, *Deo volente*, will go to press as soon as Concordia Publishing House will be ready for it. In the fourth volume we purpose to present the history

and doctrinal position of the Missouri, Wisconsin, and other synods connected with the Synodical Conference.

As appears from the two volumes now in the market, *our chief object* is to record the principal facts regarding the doctrinal position occupied at various times, either by the different American Lutheran bodies themselves or by some of their representative men, such comment only being added as we deemed indispensable. We have everywhere indicated our sources, primary as well as secondary, in order to facilitate what we desire, *viz.*, to hold us to strict accountability. Brackets found in passages cited contain additions, comments, corrections, etc., of our own, not of the respective authors quoted.

As collateral reading, especially to pages 1 to 147 of Vol. I, we urgently recommend the unique, thorough, and reliable work of our sainted colleague *Dr. A. Graebner*: "Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika. Erster Teil. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House, 1892."

While, as stated, the immediate object of our presentation is simply to state the facts concerning the questions, theologians, and synods involved, it self-evidently was an *ulterior end* of ours also, by the grace of God, to be of some service in furthering and maintaining the unity of the Spirit, an interest always and everywhere essential to the Lutheran Church.

"May the almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus grant the grace of His Holy Spirit that we all may be One in Him and constantly abide in such Christian unity, which is well-pleasing to Him! Amen." (*Form. of Conc., Epit.*, 11, § 23.)

F. BENTE,  
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

July 28, 1919.

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
<b>AMERICAN LUTHERANISM.</b>	
Introduction .....	1—10
<b>EARLY HISTORY OF AMERICAN LUTHERANISM .....</b>	
Lutheran Swedes in Delaware .....	11—16
Salzburg Lutherans in Georgia .....	16—20
Lutherans in New York .....	20—24
Justus Falckner .....	24—29
Joshua Kocherthal .....	29—32
William Christopher Berkenmeyer .....	32—35
Deterioration in New York .....	35—39
New York Ministerium .....	39—42
John Christopher Hartwick .....	42—46
Germantown, Pennsylvania .....	46—50
Slavery of Redemptioners .....	50—55
Lutherans in Pennsylvania .....	55—59
Henry Melchior Muhlenberg .....	59—64
Further Activity and Death of Muhlenberg .....	64—70
Muhlenberg's Confessionalism .....	70—73
Muhlenberg's Pietism .....	73—77
Muhlenberg's Hierarchical Tendencies .....	77—83
Muhlenberg's Unionism .....	84—91
Training of Ministers and Teachers Neglected...	91—99
Deterioration of Mother Synod .....	99—103
Unionism in the Ascendency .....	103—110
Typical Representatives of Synod .....	110—113
Synod's Unlutheran Attitude Continued .....	113—116
Lutherans in South Carolina .....	116—119
The North Carolina Synod .....	119—122
Critical Conventions .....	122—128
Gottlieb Shober .....	129—131
North Carolina Rupture .....	131—134
Lutherans in Virginia .....	134—140
Special Conference in Virginia .....	140—144
Synod of Maryland and Virginia .....	144—147

	PAGE
TENNESSEE SYNOD .....	148—237
Organization .....	148—158
Objections to General Synod .....	158—167
Attitude as to Church-fellowship .....	167—173
Efforts at Unity and Peace .....	174—184
Tennessee Justifying Her Procedure .....	184—191
Doctrinal Basis .....	192—195
Confession Enforced .....	195—198
Anti-Romanistic Attitude .....	198—207
Anti-Methodistic Attitude .....	207—213
Anti-Unionistic Attitude .....	213—217
Tennessee and Missouri .....	217—221
Peculiarities of Tennessee Synod .....	221—232
The Henkels .....	232—237

---

# American Lutheranism.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. Christianity the Only Real and True Religion.** — Religion is man's filial relation to, and union with, God. Natural religion is the concreated relation of Adam and Eve in their state of innocence toward their Creator. Fallen man, though he still lives, and moves, and has his being in God, is, in consequence of his sinful nature, *atheos*, without God, and hence without true and real religion. His attitude toward God is not that of a child to his father. Heathen religions are products of the futile efforts of men at reconciling God and restoring union with Him by their own penances and works. They are religions invented and made by men. As such they are counterfeit religions, because they persuade men to trust either in fictitious merits of their own or in God's alleged indifference toward sin. Christianity is the divine restoration of religion, *i. e.*, of the true spiritual and filial relation of fallen man toward God. Essentially, Christianity is the divine trust and assurance that God, according to His own merciful promise in the Gospel, is, for the sake of Christ and His merits, my pardoning and loving Father. It is the religion of justification, restoration, and salvation, not by human efforts and works, but by divine grace only. Paganism believes in man and his capacity for self-redemption; Christianity believes in the God-man and in salvation by His name and none other. From Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and all other religions of the world Christianity differs essentially, just as Jehovah differs from idols, as divine grace differs from human works. Christianity is not one of many species of generic religion, but the only true and real religion. Nor is Christianity related to other religions as the highest stage of an evolutionary process is to its antecedent lower stages. Christianity is divine revelation from above, not human evolution from below. Based,

as it is, on special divine interposition, revelation, and operation, Christianity is the supernatural religion. And for fallen man it is the only availing and saving religion, because it alone imparts real pardon, and engenders real and divine assurance of such pardon; because it alone really pacifies the conscience and fully satisfies the heart; and because it alone bestows new spiritual powers of sanctification. Christianity is absolute and final, it is the *non plus ultra*, the Alpha and Omega, of religion, because its God is the only true God, its Mediator is the only-begotten Son of God, its ransom is the blood of God, and its gift is perfect union with God. Compare John 8, 24; Acts 4, 12; John 14, 6; 3, 36; Gal. 1, 8. 9. Romanism, Rationalism, Arminianism, Synergism, etc., are heathen remnants within, and corruptions of, Christianity, elements absolutely foreign to, and *per se* subversive of, the religion of divine grace and revelation.

**2. The Church and Its Manifestations.** — The Christian Church is the sum total of all Christians, all true believers in the Gospel of salvation by Christ and His merits alone. Faith always, and it alone, makes one a Christian, a member of the Church. Essentially, then, the Church is invisible, because faith is a divine gift within the heart of man, hence beyond human observation. *Dr. Walther*: "The Church is invisible because we cannot see faith, the work of the Holy Spirit, which the members of this Church have in their hearts; for we can never with certainty distinguish the true Christians, who, properly, alone constitute the Church, from the hypocrites." (*Lutheraner*, 1, 21.) *Luther*: "This part, 'I believe a holy Christian Church,' is an article of faith just as well as the others. Hence Reason, even when putting on ever so many spectacles, cannot know her. She wants to be known not by seeing, but by believing; faith, however, deals with things which are not seen. *Heb. 11, 1*. A Christian may even be hidden from himself, so that he does not see his own holiness and virtue, but observes in himself only fault and unholiness." (*Luther's Works*. St. Louis, XIV, 139.) In order to belong to the Church, it is essential to believe; but it is essential neither to faith nor to the Church consciously to know yourself that you believe. Nor would it render the Church essentially visible,

if, by special revelation or otherwise, we infallibly knew of a man that he is a believer indeed. Even the Word and the Sacraments are infallible marks of the Church only because, according to God's promise, the preaching of the Gospel shall not return without fruit. Wherever and only where the Gospel is preached are we justified in assuming the existence of Christians. Yet the Church remains essentially invisible, because neither the external act of preaching nor the external act of hearing, but inward, invisible believing alone makes one a Christian, a member of the Church. Inasmuch, however, as faith *manifests* itself in the confession of the Christian truths and in outward works of love, the Church, in a way, becomes visible and subject to human observation. Yet we dare not infer that the Church is essentially visible because its effects are visible. The human soul, though its effects may be seen, remains essentially invisible. God is invisible, though the manifestations of His invisible power and wisdom can be observed in the world. Thus also faith and the Church remain essentially invisible, even where they manifest their reality in visible effects and works. Apart from the confession and proclamation of the Gospel and a corresponding Christian conversation, the *chief visible effects* and works of the Church are the foundation of local congregations, the calling of ministers, the organization of representative bodies, etc. And when these manifestations and visible works of the Church are also called churches, the effects receive the name of the cause, or the whole, the mixed body, is given the name which properly belongs to a part, the true believers, only. Visible congregations are called churches as quartz is called gold, and a field is called wheat.

**3. Visible Churches, True and False.**—The objects for which Christians, in accordance with the will of God, unite, and should unite, in visible churches and local congregations, are mutual Christian acknowledgment and edification, common Christian confession and labor, and especially the establishment of the communal office of the public ministry of the pure Gospel. This object involves, as a divine norm of Christian union, organization, and fellowship, that such only be admitted as themselves believe and confess the divine truths of the Bible, and who are not advocates of doctrines contrary to the plain

Word of God. Christian organizations and unions must not be in violation of the Christian unity of the Spirit. Organizations effected in harmony with the divine object and norm of Christian fellowship are true visible churches, *i. e.*, visible unions as God would have them. They are churches of the pure Word and Sacrament, professing the Gospel and deviating from none of its doctrines. Christians have no right to embrace, teach, and champion error. They are called upon and bound to believe, teach, and confess all, and only, Christian truths. Nor may they lawfully organize on a doctrinally false basis. Organizations persistently deviating from the doctrines of the Bible and establishing a doctrinally false basis, are sects, *i. e.*, false or impure visible Churches. Yet, though error never saves, moreover, when consistently developed, has the tendency of corrupting the whole lump, false Churches may be instrumental in saving souls, inasmuch as they retain essential parts of the Gospel-truths, and inasmuch as God's grace may neutralize the accompanying deadly error, or stay its leavening power. Indeed, individuals, by the grace of God, though errorists in their heads, may be truthists in their hearts; just as one who is orthodox in his head may, by his own fault, be heterodox in his heart. A Catholic may, by rote, call upon the saints with his lips, and yet, by the grace of God, in his heart, put his trust in Christ. And a Lutheran may confess Christ and the doctrine of grace with his lips, and yet in his heart rely on his own good character. False Churches as such, however, inasmuch as theirs is a banner of rebellion in the kingdom of Christ, do not exist by God's approval, but merely by His sufferance. It is their duty to reform on a basis of doctrinal purity and absolute conformity with the Word of God.

**4. The Lutheran Church the True Visible Church.** — The Lutheran Church is the only known religious body which, in the Book of Concord of 1580, confesses the truths of the Gospel without admixture of any doctrines contrary to the Bible. Hence its organization is in perfect harmony with the divine object and norm of Christian union and fellowship. Its basis of union is the pure Word and Sacrament. Indeed, the Lutheran Church is not the universal or only Christian Church, for there are many believers belonging to other Christian

bodies. Nor is it the only saving Church, because there are other Churches preaching Christian truths, which, by the grace of God, prove sufficient and powerful to save men. The Lutheran Church is the Church of the *pure* Word and the *unadulterated* Sacraments. It is the only Church proclaiming the alone-saving truth of the Gospel *in its purity*. It is the Church with a doctrinal basis which has the unqualified approval of the Scriptures, a basis which, materially, all Churches must accept if they would follow the lead of the Bible. And being doctrinally the pure Church, the Lutheran Church is the true visible Church of God on earth. While all sectarian Churches corrupt God's Word and the Sacraments, it is the peculiar glory of the Lutheran Church that it proclaims the Gospel *in its purity*, and administers the Sacraments without adulteration. This holds good with regard to all Lutheran organizations that are Lutheran in truth and reality. True and faithful Lutherans, however, are such only as, being convinced by actual comparison that the Concordia of 1580 is in perfect agreement with the Holy Bible, subscribe to these symbols *ex animo* and without mental reservation or doctrinal limitation, and earnestly strive to conform to them in practise as well as in theory. Subscription only to the Augustana or to Luther's Small Catechism is a sufficient test of Lutheranism, provided that the limitation does not imply, and is not interpreted as, a rejection of the other Lutheran symbols or any of its doctrines. Lutheran churches or synods, however, deviating from, or doctrinally limiting their subscription to, this basis of 1580, or merely *pro forma* professing, but not seriously and really living its principles and doctrines, are not truly Lutheran in the adequate sense of the term, though not by any means un-Lutheran in every sense of that term.

**5. Bible and Book of Concord on Christian Union and Fellowship.** — Nothing is more frequently taught and stressed by the Bible than the truth that church-fellowship presupposes, and must be preceded by, unity in the spirit, in doctrine. Amos 3, 3: "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" According to the Bible the Word of God alone is to be taught, heard, and confessed in the Christian Church. Only true teachers are to preach in the Church: Deut. 13, 6 ff.;

Jer. 23, 28. 31. 32; Matt. 5, 19; 28, 20; 2 Cor. 2, 17; Gal. 1, 8; 1 Tim. 4, 16; 1 Pet. 4, 11. Christians are to listen to true teachers only: Matt. 7, 15; John 8, 31; 10, 27. 5; Acts 2, 42; Rom. 16, 17; 2 John 10; 1 Tim. 6, 3—5; Eph. 4, 14; Titus 3, 10; 2 Cor. 6, 14—18. In the Church the true doctrine, and only the true doctrine, is to be confessed, and that unanimously by all of its members: 1 Cor. 1, 10; Eph. 4, 3—6. 13; 1 Tim. 5, 22; Matt. 10, 32. 33. Christian union and fellowship without the “same mind,” the “same judgment,” and the “same speech” with respect to the Christian truths is in direct conflict with the clear Scriptures. The unity of the Spirit demanded Eph. 4, 3 requires that Christians be one in doctrine, one, not 50 or 75, but 100 per cent. With this attitude of the Bible toward Christian union and fellowship the Lutheran symbols agree. The Eleventh Article of the Augsburg Confession declares: “For this is sufficient to true unity of the Christian Church that the Gospel be preached unanimously according to the pure understanding, and that the Sacraments be administered in agreement with the divine Word. And it is not necessary to true unity of the Christian Church that uniform ceremonies, instituted by men, be observed everywhere, as St. Paul says, Eph. 4, 4. 5: ‘One body, one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one Baptism.’” “Pure understanding of the Gospel” is here contrasted with “ceremonies instituted by men.” Accordingly, with respect to everything that God plainly teaches in the Bible unity is required, while liberty prevails only in such things as are instituted by men. In this sense the Lutheran Church understands the “*Satis est*” of the Augustana, as appears from the Tenth Article of the Formula of Concord: “We believe, teach, and confess also that no church should condemn another because one has less or more external ceremonies not commanded by God than the other, if otherwise there is agreement among them in doctrine and all its articles, as also in the right use of the Sacraments, according to the well-known saying: ‘Disagreement in fasting does not destroy agreement in faith.’” (Mueller 553, 7.) It cannot, then, be maintained successfully that, according to the Lutheran symbols, some doctrines, though clearly taught in the Bible, are irrelevant and not

necessary to church-fellowship. The Lutheran Confessions neither extend the requirements for Christian union to human teachings and institutions, nor do they limit them to merely a part of the divine doctrines of the Bible. They err neither *in excessu* nor *in defectu*. Accordingly, Lutherans, though not unmindful of the admonition to bear patiently with the weak, the weak also in doctrine and knowledge, dare not countenance any denial on principle of any of the Christian doctrines, nor sanction the unionistic attitude, which maintains that denial of minor Christian truths does not and must not, in any way, affect Christian union and fellowship. In the "Treatise on the Power of the Pope" the Book of Concord says: "It is a hard thing to want to separate from so many countries and people and maintain a separate doctrine. But here stands God's command that every one shall be separate from, and not be agreed with, those who teach falsely," etc. (§ 42.)

**6. Misguided Efforts at Christian Union.** — Perhaps never before has Christendom been divided in as many sects as at present. Denominationalism, as advocated by Philip Schaff and many Unionists, defends this condition. It views the various sects as lawful specific developments of generic Christianity, or as different varieties of the same spiritual life of the Church, as regiments of the same army, marching separately, but attacking the same common foe. Judged in the light of the Bible, however, the numerous sects, organized on various aberrations from the plain Word of God, are, as such, not normal developments, but corruptions, abnormal formations, and diseased conditions of the Christian Church. Others, realizing the senseless waste of moneys and men, and feeling the shame of the scandalous controversies, the bitter conflicts, and the dishonorable competition of the disrupted Christian sects, develop a feverish activity in engineering and promoting external ecclesiastical unions, regardless of internal doctrinal dissensions. For centuries the Pope has been stretching out his arms to the Greek and Protestant Churches, even making concessions to the Ruthenians and other Uniates as to the language of the liturgy, the marriage of priests, the cup to be given to the laity, etc. In order to present a united political front to the Pope and the Emperor, Zwingli, in 1529, offered

Luther the hand of fellowship in spite of doctrinal differences. In political interests, Frederick William III of Prussia, in 1817, forced a union without unity on the Lutherans and Reformed of his kingdom. In America this Prussian Union was advocated by the German Evangelical Synod of North America. The Church of England, in 1862, 1874, and 1914, endeavored to establish a union with the Old Catholics and the Russian Church even at the sacrifice of the *Filioque*. (The Lutherans, when, in 1559 and again in 1673 to 1681, negotiations were opened to bring about an understanding with the Greek Church, insisted on unity in the doctrines of Justification and of Free Will, to which Jeremiah II took exception.) Pierpont Morgan, a number of years ago, appropriated a quarter million dollars in order to bring the Churches of America under the leadership of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which demands as the only condition of union the recognition of their "historical episcopate," a fiction, historical as well as doctrinal. In 1919 three Protestant Episcopal bishops crossed the seas seeking a conferee with the Pope and the representatives of the Greek Orthodox churches in the interest of a League of Churches. The Evangelical Alliance, organized 1846 at London, aimed to unite all Protestants against Rome on a basis of nine general statements, from which the distinctive doctrines were eliminated. The Federal Council, embracing 30 Protestant denominations, was organized with the definite understanding that no Church, by joining, need sacrifice any of its peculiar doctrines. The unions effected between the Congregationalists and Methodists in Canada, and between the Calvinistic Northern Presbyterians and the Arminian Cumberland Presbyterians in our own country, were also unionistic. Since the beginning of the last century the Campbellites and kindred sects were zealous in uniting the Churches by urging them to drop their distinctive names and confessions, call themselves "Christians" or "Disciples," and accept as their confession the Bible only. Indeed, the number of physicians seeking to heal the schisms of Christendom is legion. But their cure is worse than the disease. Unionistic henotes cannot but fail utterly, because their object is not unity in the Spirit of truth, but union in the spirit of diversity and error.

**7. Lutherans Qualified to Head True Union Movement.** — Most of the union-efforts are failures *ab initio*. They seek outward union without inward unity. They proceed on a false diagnosis of the case. They observe the symptoms, and overlook or intentionally ignore the hidden cause, the deviations from the Word of God, which disturb the unity of the Spirit. And doctrinal discussions, which alone can bring about a real cure, are intentionally omitted and expressly declared taboo, as, *e. g.*, by the Federal Council. The Church, suffering from blood-poisoning, is pronounced cured when the sores have been covered. They put a plaster over the gap in Zion's wall, which may hide, but does not heal, the breach. Universally, sectarian henotics have proved to be spiritual quacks with false aims, false methods, and false diagnosis. Nowhere among the sects a single serious effort to cure the malady from within and to restore to the Church of Christ real unity, unity in the true doctrine! Indeed, how could a genuine unity-union movement originate with the sects? Can the blind lead the blind? Can the beggar enrich the poor? Can the sects give to Christendom what they themselves are in need of? The Lutheran Church is the only denomination qualified to head a true unity-union movement, because she alone is in full possession of those unadulterated truths without which there can be neither true Christian unity nor God-pleasing Christian union. Accordingly, the Lutheran Church has the mission to lead the way in the efforts at healing the ruptures of Christendom. But in order to do so, the Lutheran Church must be loyal to herself, loyal to her principles, and true to her truths. The mere Lutheran name is unavailing. The American Lutheran synods, in order successfully to steer a unity-union movement, must purge themselves thoroughly from the leaven of error, of indifferentism and unionism. A complete and universal return to the Lutheran symbols is the urgent need of the hour. Only when united in undivided loyalty to the divine truths of God's Word, will the American Lutheran Church be able to measure up to its peculiar calling of restoring to Christendom the truths of the Gospel in their pristine purity, and in and with these truths the true unity of the Spirit and a fellowship and union, both beneficial to man and well-pleasing to God.

**8. Lutheran Statistics.** — God has blessed the Lutheran Church in America abundantly, more than in any other country of the world. From a few scattered groups she has grown into a great people. In 1740 there were in America about 50 Lutheran congregations. In 1820 the Lutheran Church numbered 6 synods, with almost 900 congregations, 40,000 communicants, and 175 pastors. In 1867 about 1,750 pastors, 3,100 congregations, and 332,000 communicants. Twenty-five years later, 60 synods, with about 5,000 pastors, 8,390 congregations, and 1,187,000 communicants. In the jubilee year, 1917, the Lutheran Church in America embraced (besides about 200 independent congregations) 65 synods, 24 of which belonged to the General Synod (350,000 communicants), 13 to the General Council (500,000 communicants), 8 to the United Synod South (53,000 communicants), and 6 to the Synodical Conference (800,000 communicants). The entire Lutheran Church in America reported in 1917 about 9,700 pastors; 15,200 congregations; 2,450,000 communicants; 28 theological seminaries, with 112 professors and 1,170 students; 41 colleges, with 640 professors and 950 students; 59 academies, with 404 teachers and 6,700 pupils; 8 ladies' seminaries, with 72 instructors and 340 pupils; 64 orphanages, with 4,200 inmates; 12 home-finding and children's friend societies; 45 homes for the aged, with 1,650 inmates; 7 homes for defectives, with 430 inmates; 9 deaconess homes, with 370 sisters; 50 hospitals; 19 hospices; 17 immigrant homes and seamen's missions; and 10 miscellaneous institutions; a large number of periodicals of many kinds, printed in numerous Lutheran publishing houses, in English, German, Swedish, Norwegian and Danish, Icelandic, Finnish, Slavonian, Lettish, Estonian, Polish, Portuguese, Lithuanian, etc., etc.

---

## Early History of American Lutheranism.

---

### LUTHERAN SWEDES IN DELAWARE.

9. **New Sweden.** — The first Lutheran pastor who set his foot on American soil in August, 1619, was Rasmus Jensen of Denmark. He was chaplain of a Danish expedition numbering 66 Lutherans under Captain Jens Munck, who took possession of the land about Hudson Bay in the name of the Danish crown. In his diary we read of the faithful pastoral work, the sermons, and the edifying death, on February 20, 1620, of this Lutheran pastor. However, the first Lutheran minister to serve a *Lutheran colony* in America was Reorus Torkillus. He was born in 1609 at Faessberg, Sweden, educated at Linkoeping, and for a time was chaplain at Goeteborg. Gustavus Adolphus already had entertained the idea of founding a colony in America, chiefly for the purpose of carrying on mission-work among the Indians. Peter Minuit, a German, who had come to Manhattan Island in 1626 to represent the interests of the Dutch West India Company (organized in 1621), led also the first Swedish expedition to Delaware in December, 1637. Nine expeditions followed, until the flourishing colony was captured by the Dutch in 1655. The work of Torkillus, who died September 7, 1643, was continued by John Campanius (1601 to 1683), who arrived on February 15, 1643. Three years later, one hundred years after the death of Luther, he dedicated the first Lutheran Church in America at Christina (Wilmington). His translation of Luther's Small Catechism into the language of the Delaware Indians antedates Eliot's Indian Bible, but was not published till 1696. Returning to Sweden in 1648, Campanius left about 200 souls in the charge of Lars Lock (Lockenius), who served them until his end, in 1688. In 1654, Pastors Vertunius and Hjorst arrived with 350 additional souls. Both, however, returned to Sweden when Stuyvesant took possession of the colony in 1655, permitting the Swedes in Delaware to retain only Lars Lock as pastor. Jacob Fabricius, who, after rendering his stay in New Amsterdam (New

York) impossible, was laboring among the Dutch along the Delaware from 1671 to 1675, before long also began to do mission-work among the Swedes and Finns, at the same time intriguing against Lock, whose cup of sorrow was already filled with family troubles and other griefs. In 1677 Fabricius took charge of the Swedes at Wicaco (Philadelphia), where he, though blind since 1682, continued faithfully to wait on his office until his death in 1693 (1696). He preached in Dutch, which, as reported, the Swedes "spoke perfectly."

**10. Succored by the King of Sweden.** — In 1692 the now orphaned Lutherans in Delaware addressed themselves to Karl XI, who promised to help them. However, four years passed before Pastor Rudman arrived with two assistants, Bjoerk (Biörek) and Auren, as well as with a consignment of Bibles and other books. New life entered the Swedish colony. In 1699 the new Trinity Church was erected at Christina, and in 1700 Gloria Dei Church in Wicaco (Philadelphia). From the very beginning, however, a spirit of legalism, hierarchy, and of unionism wormed its way into the promising harvest. The congregations were not taught to govern themselves, but were ruled by provosts sent from Sweden. In the interest of discipline, Andreas Sandel, who arrived in 1702, introduced a system of monetary penances. In his *History of the Lutheran Church in America* Dr. A. Graebner writes: "Whoever came to church tipsy, was to pay 40 shillings and do public penance. Blasphemy of the divine Word or the Sacraments carried with it a fine of 5 pounds sterling and church penance; to sing at unseemly hours was punished by a fine of 6 shillings; such as refused to submit to the discipline were to be excluded from the congregation and to be refused interment at its cemetery." (86.) Eric Unander, who returned to Sweden in 1760, employed the same methods to keep order in the congregational meetings. A. Rudman, after his brief pastorate among the Dutch Lutherans in New York during 1702, returned to Philadelphia. From 1707 to his death, in 1708, he served an Episcopal church without severing his connection with the Swedes. His successors followed his footsteps. From 1737 to 1741 J. Dylander preached at Gloria Dei Church in German, Swedish, and English every Sunday, served the Germans in Germantown

and Lancaster, and, in the absence of their pastor, ministered also to the Episcopalians. The same practise was observed by the provosts: Eric Bjoerk, who was appointed the first provost in 1712, and returned to Sweden in 1714; A. Sandel, who also served Episcopalian congregations and returned in 1719; A. Hesselius, who left in 1723, and in Sweden, 1725, published a short report of the conditions prevailing in America; Peter Tranberg, who was stationed at Raccoon and Pennsneck, N. J., from 1726 to 1740, and at Christina till his death in 1748; J. Sandin, who arrived in 1746, dying two years later; Israel Acrelius, who arrived in 1749, saw the language question become acute, served Episcopalian congregations, and returned to Sweden in 1756, where he published (1759) a description of the conditions in New Sweden; Olaf Parlin, who arrived in 1750 and died in 1757; Dr. C. M. Wrangel, who was provost from 1759 to 1768, assisted in rejuvenating the Pennsylvania Synod in 1760, and began a seminary with Peter Muhlenberg, Daniel Kuhn, and Christian Streit as students; Nils Collin, whose activity extended from 1770 to 1831, during which time he had eight Episcopalian assistant pastors in succession.

**11. Church-fellowship with Episcopilians.** — In 1710 Pastor Sandel reported as follows on the unionism practised by the Swedes and Episcopilians: "As pastors and teachers we have at all times maintained friendly relations and intimate converse with the English preachers, one always availing himself of the help and advice of the other. At their pastoral conferences we always consulted with them. We have repeatedly preached English in their churches when the English preachers lacked the time because of a journey or a death. If anywhere they laid the corner-stone of a church, we were invited, and attended. When their church in Philadelphia was enlarged, and the Presbyterians had invited them to worship in their church, they declined and asked permission to come out to Wicaco and conduct their services in our church, which I granted. This occurred three Sundays in succession, until their church was finished; and, in order to manifest the unity still more, Swedish hymns were sung during the English services. Also Bishop Swedberg [of Sweden], in his letters, always encouraged us in such unity and intimacy with the

Anglicans; although there exists some difference between them and us touching the Lord's Supper, etc., yet he did not want that small difference to rend asunder the bond of peace. We enter upon no discussion of this point; neither do we touch upon such things when preaching in their churches; nor do they seek to win our people to their view in this matter; on the contrary, we live in intimate and brotherly fashion with one another, they also calling us brethren. They have the government in their hands, we are under them; it is enough that they desire to have such friendly intercourse with us; we can do nothing else than render them every service and fraternal intimaey as long as they are so amiable and confiding, and have not sought in the least to draw our people into their churches. As our church is called by them 'the sister church of the Church of England,' so we also live fraternally together. God grant that this may long continue!" (G., 118.) Thus from the very beginning the Swedish bishops encouraged and admonished their emissaries to fraternize especially with the Episcopalian. And the satisfaction with this state of affairs on the part of the Episcopalian ministers appears from the following testimonial which they gave to Hesselius and J. A. Lidenius in 1723: "They were ever welcome in our pulpits, as we were also welcome in their pulpits. Such was our mutual agreement in doctrine and divine service, and so regularly did they attend our conferences that, aside from the different languages in which we and they were called to officiate, no difference could be perceived between us." (131.)

**12. Absorbed by the Episcopal Church.**—The evil influence which the unionism practised by the Swedish provosts and ministers exercised upon the Lutheran congregations appears from the resolution of the congregation at Pennsneck, in 1742, henceforth to conduct English services exclusively, and that, according to the Book of Common Prayer. In the same year Pastor Gabriel Naesman wrote to Sweden: "As to my congregation, the people at first were scattered among other congregations, and among the sects which are tolerated here, and it is with difficulty that I gather them again to some extent. The great lack of harmony prevailing among the members makes my congregation seem like a kingdom not at one with

itself, and therefore near its ruin." (335.) The unionism indulged in also accounts for the trouble which the Swedes experienced with the emissaries of Zinzendorf: L. T. Nyberg, Abr. Reinke, and P. D. Bryzelius (who severed his connection with the Moravians in 1760, became a member of the Pennsylvania Synod, and in 1767 was ordained by the Bishop of London). Unionism paved the way, and naturally led to the final undoing of the Lutheran Swedes in Delaware. It was but in keeping with the unionism advised from Sweden, practised in Delaware, and indulged in to the limit by himself, when Provost Wrangel gave the final *coup de grace* to the first Lutheran Church in America. Dr. Wrangel, the bosom-friend of H. M. Muhlenberg, openly and extensively fraternized not only with the Episcopalians, but also with the Reformed, the Presbyterians (in Princeton), and the Methodists, notably the revivalist Whitefield. And, evidently foreseeing the early and unavoidable *debacle* of Swedish Lutheranism in Delaware, von Wrangel, at his departure for Sweden, suffered the Episcopalians to use him as a tool to deliver the poor, weakened, and oppressed congregations, whose leader he had been, into the hands of the Anglicans. (392.) On his way home Wrangel carried with him an important letter of introduction from the Episcopalian Richard Peters to the Bishop of London, the ecclesiastical superior of the Anglican ministers and congregations in the American Colonies. The letter, dated August 30, 1768, reads, in part: "Now Dr. Wrangel intends to utilize properly the general aversion [in Delaware] to the Presbyterians in order to unite the great mass of Lutherans and Swedes with the Church of England, which, as you know, is but small numerically and in humble circumstances in this province; through union with the German Lutherans, however, we both would become respectable. According to Dr. Smith's and my opinion this could be effected through our Academy. In it we could establish a theological professorship; then German and English young men could be educated, and as their training would embrace both languages, they could preach German as well as English at places where both nations are mixed. That would unite us all and make us one people in life and love. It is a happy thought. I would desire your Excellency to speak with Dr. Wrangel, and encourage him as much as possible. In

this matter I have written to the two archbishops, asking them to consider it carefully together with your Excellency. I am sure that now the opportunity is good to bring this desirable affair to a happy conclusion." (394.) In a document dated June 25, 1789, the Swedish government served official notice on the congregations in America that in future they could no longer expect help from Sweden, alleging that, whereas "the purpose, the Swedish tongue," had come to an end, it was but just that in future also the disbursements in Sweden should be discontinued. (401.) The result was that one congregation after another united with the Episcopalians. By 1846 the Lutheran name had disappeared from the last charter. Thus the entire Swedish mission territory, all of whose congregations exist to the present day, was lost to the Lutheran Church. The chief causes of this loss were: unionism, hierarchical paternalism, interference from Sweden, the failure to provide for schools and for the training of suitable pastors, and the lack of Swedish and, later, of English Lutheran literature. The report of the Pennsylvania Ministerium of 1762 remarks: "For several generations the Swedish schools unfortunately have been neglected in the Swedish congregations; Dr. Wrangel, however, has organized an English school in one of his parishes where Luther's Catechism is read in an English translation." From the very beginning the foundations of the Lutheran structure along the Delaware were both laid insecurely and undermined by its builders.

### SALZBURG LUTHERANS IN GEORGIA.

**13. Banished by Archbishop Anton Firmian.** — Like the Swedes in Delaware, so also the Salzburg Lutherans in Georgia, as a Church, have disappeared in the course of years. The story of their vicissitudes and especially of their colony Ebenezer, however, has retained a peculiar charm. On Reformation Day of 1731 the cruel Archbishop Anton, Knight of Firmian, issued a manifesto which ordered the Evangelicals of Salzburg, Austria, either to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church, or to emigrate, leaving their property and their young children behind them. Some eighteen thousand Lutherans chose banishment rather than deny the faith that

was in them. On their journey the exiles awakened lively sympathy by singing their *Exulantenlied* (Hymn of the Exiles) which Joseph Schaitberger had composed for those banished in 1685. The eleven stanzas of this hymn read in the original as follows: "1. I bin ein armer Exulant, A so tu i mi schreiba; Ma tuet mi aus dem Vaterland Um Gottes Wort vertreiba. 2. Das wass i wohl, Herr Jesu Christ, Es is dir a so ganga. Itzt will i dein Nachfolger sein; Herr, mach's nach deim Verlanga! 3. A Pilgrim bin i halt numehr, Muss reise fremde Strossa; Das bitt i di, mein Gott und Herr, Du wirst mi nit verlossen. 4. Den Glauba hob i frei bekennt, Des derf i mi nit schaema, Wenn ma mi glei ein Ketzer nennt Und tuet mir's Leba nehma. 5. Ketta und Banda wor mir en Ehr Um Jesu willa z' dulda, Und dieses macht die Glaubenslehr Und nit mei boes Verschulda. 6. Muss i glei in das Elend fort, Will i mi do nit wehra; So hoff i do, Gott wird mir dort Och gute Fruend beschera. 7. Herr, wie du willt, i gib mi drein, Bei dir will i verbleiba; I will mi gern dem Wille dein Geduldig unterschreiba. 8. Muss i glei fort, in Gottes Nam! Und wird mir alles g'nomma, So wass i wohl, die Himmelskron Wer i amal bekomma. 9. So muss i heut von meinem Haus, Die Kinderl muss i lossa. Mei Gott, es treibt mir Zaehrel aus, Zu wandern fremde Strossa. 10. Mein Gott, fuehr mi in ene Stodt, Wo i dein Wort kann hoba, Darin will i di frueh und spot In meinem Herzel loba. 11. Soll i in diesem Jammertal Noch laenger in Armut leba, So hoff i do, Gott wird mir dort Ein bessre Wohnung geba." — The cruelly persecuted and banished Salzburgers were hospitably received in Prussia and Holland, where many found a permanent home. Others resolved to emigrate to Georgia, where, through the mediation of Dr. Urlsperger of Augsburg and the court preacher Ziegenhagen of London, the British government promised them religious liberty and other advantages.

**14. Ebenezer in Georgia.** — The first ninety-one persons of the Salzburg colony, which later numbered about 1,200 souls, landed at Savannah, March 10, 1734. They were accompanied by Pastors John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau, who had received their education at Halle. Governor Oglethorpe led the immigrants twenty-three miles northwest of

their landing-place, where they erected a monument of stones and called the settlement Ebenezer. Seven years later (1741) Jerusalem Church was built, for which also Whitefield had made collections in Europe. In 1743 a second church was dedicated in the country. Dr. Graebner records the following statistics: "In 1743 the congregation numbered 279 souls: 81 men, 70 married women, 6 widows, 52 boys, 59 girls, and 11 maid-servants." (554.) In 1744 the Salzburgers celebrated the tenth anniversary of their deliverance on the tenth of March, a day which was annually observed by them as a day of thanksgiving. Sorrow followed the joyous celebration, for in the following year, January 11, 1745, their beloved Pastor Gronau was called to his eternal reward. Dwelling on Gronau's edifying death, Bolzius wrote in a letter dated January 14, 1845: "His heart was in deep communion with the dear Savior. With profound desire he received the Lord's Supper a few days before his dissolution. He distinctly recognized all who surrounded him [when he was dying], and exhorted them to praise God. It seemed, and such was also inferred from his words, as though, like Stephen, he saw something extraordinarily beautiful and glorious. At last, after stretching forth his hands and taking leave of all, he directed his folded hands toward heaven, praying and praising God. Finally, saying, 'Do come, Lord Jesus, Amen, Amen, Amen!' he closed his eyes and mouth, and entered peacefully into the joy of God." (556.) Gronau was succeeded by Pastor H. H. Lemke, of Schaumburg, who previously had been active in the institutions at Halle. His diploma of vocation was signed by Samuel Urlsperger in the stead and name of the English Society for the Promotion of the Knowledge of Christ. Thus Ebenezer was actually the foundation of a mission society whose members were for the most part adherents of the Reformed Church. In 1742 Pastor John Ulrich Driessler had been called to the congregation of Frederica, south of Savannah. He entered upon his labors in 1744, and died three years later. In the following years several ships arrived bringing emigrants from Swabia. To meet the growing needs Pastor Chr. Rabenhorst was sent to the colony in 1753. In 1765 Pastor Bolzius died, sixty-two years old, repeating the words: "Father, I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me be

with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory which Thou hast given Me." (John 17, 24.) None of the three pastors, who were easily able to minister to the spiritual needs of the colony, displayed a missionary spirit in any marked degree.

**15. Dissension and Disintegration.** — While Bolzius, Lemke, and Rabenhorst had labored together in harmony, dissension and strife began to blast the blissful peace and quiet contentment of Ebenezer, when, after the death also of Lemke, Pastor C. F. Triebner arrived in 1773. The congregation was torn by factions, the minority siding with Triebner in his bitter opposition to Rabenhorst. When the majority refused Triebner permission to officiate in the church, the minority forced the doors. After a new lock had been secured by the majority, the minority began to conduct separate services in the home of John Wertsch, and entered suit before the Governor of Georgia. This brought about the loss of their church property, the Governor, in accordance with the express wording of the patent grant of April 2, 1771, deeding Jerusalem Church to the Episcopilians. The patent contained the provision: ". . . for the only proper use, benefit, and behoof of two ministers of the Gospel, residents within the parish aforesaid, using and exercising divine service according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England within the said parish and their successors forever." (599.) In 1774 Muhlenberg arrived, commissioned by the "English Society" to conduct an investigation and to restore peace. A reconciliation was effected, and articles of agreement were signed by the pastors and the members of the congregation. Before long, however, the old discord broke out again and continued unabated until the death of Pastor Rabenhorst in 1777. Triebner now secured a firm footing in the congregation. But new storms were brewing for the poor people. In 1775 the War of Independence had broken out, in which Triebner not only espoused the cause of England himself, but urged his congregation to do the same, thereby bringing untold misery upon Ebenezer. Triebner, taken captive and severely dealt with, finally found his way back to Europe. After the war Ebenezer presented a sad spectacle. Soldiers had used the church as a hospital and stable; Rabenhorst's home had been given to the flames; fields were laid waste;

and the inhabitants were scattered and despoiled of their property. The congregation, however, recovered, and through the endeavors of Urlsperger received a new pastor in the person of John Ernest Bergmann, who had studied at Leipzig. In 1785 he assumed the duties at Ebenezer, formerly discharged by two and three pastors. But, though a diligent worker, Bergmann was not a faithful Lutheran, nor did he build up a truly Lutheran congregation. There came a time when but very little of Lutheranism was to be found in the old colony of the Salzburgers. (600.) During Bergmann's long pastorate, which was conducted in the German language exclusively until 1824, the Americanized young people gradually began to drift away from the mother church. However, to the present day descendants of the Salzburgers are found in the Lutheran congregations of Savannah and of the Georgia Synod.

### LUTHERANS IN NEW YORK.

**16. Persecuted in New Amsterdam.** — In the first part of the seventeenth century the Lutheran Church was by law prohibited and oppressed in the United Netherlands. When the power of the papists had come to an end, Reformed tendencies gained the ascendancy, and Calvinists reaped where Lutherans had sowed with tears. While claiming to be adherents of the Augsburg Confession, they persecuted the Lutherans, forbidding all Lutheran worship in public meeting-houses as well as in private dwellings. Nevertheless the Lutheran Church not only continued to exist, but even made some headway in Amsterdam, Antwerp, and other places. The greatest handicap, however, which also prevented the Dutch Lutherans from developing any missionary activity, was the lack of a native ministry thoroughly conversant with the language of the people. Conditions similar to those in Holland obtained in the American colonies. Like the mother country, New Amsterdam had a law prohibiting the exercise of any religion save that of the Reformed faith. Sanford H. Cobb, in his work *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, quotes the law as follows: "No other religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherland except the Reformed, as it is at present preached and practised by public authority in the United Netherlands; and for this

purpose the [Dutch West India] Company shall provide and maintain good and suitable preachers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick (Ziekentrooster)." (303, 321 f.) However, the report of the Jesuit Jogues, who sojourned in the colony about 1642, shows that this law was not strictly enforced during the first part of the century. Also the Lutherans were permitted to conduct reading-services in their homes. But when the Dutch and German Lutherans (the former having arrived in New Amsterdam probably as early as 1624) had organized a congregation in 1648, and in 1653 requested the authorities to grant them permission to call a Lutheran pastor, they received a curt refusal at the hands of the governor, Peter Stuyvesant. The two Reformed domines, Megapolensis, who had arrived in 1649, and Drisius, who came in 1652 (the successors to Michaelius, who came over in 1623, and Bogardus, who followed him in 1632), proved to be the most bigoted and fanatical in the opposition to the request of the Lutherans. Instead of their petition being granted, the Lutherans were now forced to have their children baptized in the Reformed churches by Reformed pastors, and to promise to bring them up in the Confession of Dort; and private services in dwellings were made punishable with severe penalties. Peter Stuyvesant, who was also deacon of the Reformed Church, declared at the close of a session of the church council, that, if any one ever dared to appeal from his decision to the authorities in Holland, he would reduce his stature by the length of his head and send him back to the old country in pieces. But the Lutherans were not intimidated. When Stuyvesant denied their request for a Lutheran pastor, they appealed to the authorities overseas. The two Reformed domines also sent a letter to Holland, setting forth the dire consequences which were bound to follow in the wake of such religious toleration.

**17. Moderation Advised.** — The authorities in Holland agreed with the intolerant domines and directed Stuyvesant to allow none but the Reformed religion. Yet, while denying the request of the Lutherans, they, at the same time, urged the governor to employ mildness and moderate means in dealing with them. Cobb gives the following translation of these instructions: "We have decided absolutely to deny the request

made by some of our inhabitants, adherents of the Augsburg Confession, for a preacher and free exercise of their religion, pursuant to the custom hitherto observed by us and the West India Company, on account of the consequences arising therefrom; and we recommend to you also not to receive any similar petitions, but rather to turn them off in the most civil and least offensive way, and to employ all possible, but moderate means to induce them to listen and finally join the Reformed Church." (313.) The letter was dated February 26, 1654. But notwithstanding this rebuff, the Lutherans persisted in their demand, and held religious services in their houses without a minister, declaring that "Heaven was above law." This excited the wrath of the autoeratic governor, who was not accustomed to brook opposition, nor knew how to employ mildness, wisdom, and "moderate means" in dealing with anybody, least of all with the Lutherans. Instead of persuasion he employed force; and instead of trying "the most civil and least offensive way," he resorted to harsh and most offensive measures. On February 1, 1656, a stringent "Ordinance against Conventicles" was posted, which ran: "Some unqualified persons in such meetings assume the ministerial office, the expounding and explanation of the holy Word of God, without being called or appointed thereto by ecclesiastical or civil authority, which is in direct contravention and opposition to the general Civil and Ecclesiastical order of our Fatherland, besides that many dangerous heresies and schisms are to be apprehended. Therefore, the director-general and council . . . absolutely and expressly forbid all such conventicles and meetings, whether public or private, differing from the customary, and not only lawful, but scripturally founded and ordained meetings of the Reformed divine service, as this is observed . . . according to the Synod of Dordrecht." The penalties imposed by the act were £100 *Flemish* for the preacher and £25 for every attendant at such services. (317.) A number of Lutherans were cast into prison. Realizing that such harsh measures would prove hurtful to their business interests, the authorities in Holland, in an order dated June 14, 1656, rebuked Stuyvesant for his high-handed procedure, saying: "We should have gladly seen that your Honor had not posted up the transmitted edict against the Lutherans, and had not punished

them by imprisonment, . . . inasmuch as it has always been our intention to treat them with all peaceableness and quietness. Wherefore, your Honor shall not cause any more such or similar edicts to be published without our previous knowledge, but suffer the matter to pass in silence, and permit them their free worship in their houses." (314.)

**18. Johannes Ernestus Gutwasser.** — Evidently, to the Lutherans the time seemed favorable to renew their urgent requests for a pastor of their own. And in July, 1657, Johannes Ernestus Gutwasser (not Goetwater, or Gutwater, or Goetwasser), a German, sent by the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam, arrived on Manhattan Island. Great was the fury of the Reformed domines and vehement their clamor for his immediate return. They wrote a letter to the classis in Amsterdam in which, according to Cobb, "they relate that 'a Lutheran preacher, Goetwater, arrived to the great joy of the Lutherans and the especial discontent and disappointment of the congregation of this place, yea, of the whole land, even the English. We went to the Director-General,' who summoned Goetwater, and found that he had as credentials only a letter from a Lutheran consistory in Europe to the Lutheran Church in New Amsterdam. The governor ordered him not to preach, even in a private house. The domines lament, 'We already have the snake in our bosom,' and urge Stuyvesant to open the consistory's letter, which, oddly enough, he refused to do, but consented to the ministers' demand that Goetwater be sent back in the ship that brought him. Now this Lutheran parson,' the Dutch ministers conclude, 'is a man of a godless and scandalous life; a rolling, rollicking, unseemly carl, who is more inclined to look into the wine-can than to pore over the Bible, and would rather drink a can of brandy for two hours than preach one.'" (315.) But, though maligned and persecuted, Gutwasser did not suffer himself to be intimidated, and even began to preach. So great and persistent, however, was the fury of the fanatics that he was finally compelled to yield and return to Holland, in 1659. The second Lutheran pastor to arrive on Manhattan Island while the Dutch were still in power was Abelius Zetskorn, whom Stuyvesant directed to the Dutch settlement of New Amstel (New Castle) on the Delaware. The

tyranny of Stuyvesant, however, was abruptly ended when in 1664 the English fleet sailed into the harbor and compelled the surrender of New Amsterdam. In the Articles of Capitulation it was specifically agreed that "the Dutch here shall enjoy the liberty of their consciences in divine worship and church discipline." And according to the proclamation of the Duke of York, also the Lutherans were granted religious liberty, "as long as His Royal Highness shall not order otherwise."

#### JUSTUS FALCKNER.

**19. Fabricius, Arensius, Falckner in New York.** — In 1669, five years after the fall of New Amsterdam, Magister Jacobus Fabricius was sent over by the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam to minister to the Lutherans in New York and Albany. Being of a churlish and quarrelsome nature, he soon fell out with the authorities of Albany and was banished from the town. The New York congregation was torn by factions, many demanding the resignation of Fabricius on the ground of "deportment unbecoming a pastor." The matter was even carried before the governor. A solution of the problem was brought about through the arrival of a new pastor from Holland in the person of Bernhardus Arensius (Arnzius). Fabricius obtained permission to install Arensius as his successor, and went to Delaware, where he labored among the Dutch and Swedish Lutherans. Arensius continued to serve the Lutherans in New York and Albany from 1671 to 1691. The mildness and firmness which he displayed in trying circumstances repaired the harm done by Fabricius. Dr. Graebner says: "In Pastor Arnzius the Dutch Lutheran congregations on the Hudson had an excellent preacher and pastor, a man of whom they had no cause whatever to be ashamed. Above all he was a sound Lutheran, whose opposition to any and all church-fellowship with the Reformed was so decided that he abstained even from cultivating social intercourse with the pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church, although it would seem that the existing conditions called for it." (70.) After the death of Pastor Arensius, in 1691, a long vacancy ensued, lasting till 1702, when Pastor Rudman, a Swede from Philadelphia, acceding to their repeated requests, took charge of the congregation in

New York. But finding himself unequal to the task of regulating their deranged affairs, he resigned in 1703. Rudman was succeeded by Justus Falckner, who was ordained November 25, 1703, in the Swedish Gloria Dei Church of Wicaco, by Rudman, Bjoerk, and Sandel, the first Lutheran ordination in America. The new pastor, who arrived in New York on December 2, 1703, proved to be a true Lutheran, a faithful shepherd of the flock committed to his care, among which he labored with much blessing for a period of twenty years. Graebner says: "It is a most pleasing, captivating figure that we behold in Pastor Justus Falckner during the twenty years of his activity, a man of excellent parts, of splendid knowledge, of a delicate disposition, of a truly pious frame of mind, of a decidedly Lutheran standpoint, of active and enduring diligence in his office, in short, an all-round pastor. He had assumed the duties of his office with the consciousness that he was able to accomplish nothing without the gracious assistance of God; that God would grant him sufficiency was the fervent prayer of his heart." (94.) Justus Falckner, born November 22, 1672, was the fourth son of Daniel Falckner, Lutheran pastor at Langenreinsdorf, Crimmitschau, and Zwickau, Saxony. He entered the University of Halle, January 20, 1693, and studied theology under A. H. Francke. He completed his course, but shrank from assuming the tremendous responsibility of the ministry. On April 23, 1700, he acquired the power of attorney for the sale of William Penn's lands in Pennsylvania, and left with his older brother, Daniel, for America. In 1701 ten thousand acres of Penn's lands were sold to Provost Rudman and other Swedes. Probably this transaction brought Rudman into closer contact with J. Falckner, who also had attended the Swedish church in Philadelphia. The result was that Falckner was ordained and placed in charge of the congregations in New York and Albany. While a student at Halle, Falckner wrote the hymn: "Auf! ihr Christen, Christi Glieder — Rise, Ye Children of Salvation." (*Dict. of Hymnology*, 363.)

**20. Falckner's Spirituality.** — Falckner was of a spiritual and truly pastoral frame of mind. He was a faithful and humble shepherd, who loved the flock entrusted to him

with all his heart. "God, the Father of all goodness and Lord of great majesty, who hast thrust me into this harvest, be with me, Thy humble and very weak laborer, with Thy special grace, without which I must needs perish under the burden of temptations which frequently descend upon me with violence. In Thee, Lord, have I put my trust, let me not be confounded! Render me sufficient for my calling. I have not run, but Thou hast sent, hast thrust me into this office. Meanwhile forgive whatever, without my knowledge, my evil nature may add; pardon me, who am humbly crying unto Thee, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen." Such was the prayer with which, in classic Latin, Falckner prefaced his entries in the church register. Following are some of the prayers which he appended to his entries of baptisms: "O Lord, Lord, may this child, together with the three aforementioned Hackensack children, be and remain recorded in the Book of Life, through Jesus Christ. Amen." "God grant that also this child be and remain embraced in Thy eternal grace and favor through Jesus Christ. Amen." "O Lord, may this child be commended unto Thee for its temporal and eternal welfare, through Jesus Christ. Amen." "May this child also, O Lord God, be and remain an heiress of Thy Kingdom of Grace and of the glory which Christ has obtained for us. Amen." "God grant that this child may overcome Satan, the world, and its own corrupted nature, and with Christ reign and triumph eternally for Christ's sake. Amen." "Lord Jesus, grant that this child may taste and enjoy Thy sweet love and grace in time and eternity." In 1704 Falckner baptized in his congregation at New York "Maria, the daughter of Are of Guinea, a negro, and his wife Jora, both Christians of our congregation." To the record of this baptism he added the prayer: "Lord, merciful God, who regardest not the person of men, but in every nation, he that feareth Thee and doeth right is accepted before Thee: let this child be clothed with the white garment of innocence and righteousness, and so remain, through Christ, the Redeemer and Savior of all men. Amen." In later years, Falckner, after recording the baptisms of an entire year, would add a prayer like the following: "Lord, Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquities and transgressions and sin: do not let one of the

names above written be blotted out of Thy Book, but let them be written and remain therein, through Jesus Christ, Thy dear Son. Amen." One of the intercessions recorded with the entries of confirmations reads as follows: "Lord Jesus Christ, should Satan seek to sift as wheat one or the other of these members of Thy congregation, then do Thou pray for them to Thy heavenly Father that their faith may not cease, for the sake of Thy holy merit. Amen." Marriages are recorded with prayers like the following: "Grant, Lord God, that also this union may redound to the honor of Thy holy name, to the promotion of Thy kingdom, and to the temporal and eternal blessing of those united, through Jesus Christ. Amen." Graebner remarks: "What a gifted and sincerely pious pastoral frame of mind appears in the entries of the noble man, whom God, in wonderful ways, led from far-away Saxony to New York and here made a shepherd and teacher of the Dutch Lutherans!" (94 ff.)

**21. Distinctive Doctrines Stressed.** — Tender love for his flock did not silence Falckner's confessional Lutheranism, nor did it induce him to keep doctrinal differences in the background. He was no unionist. On the contrary, in order to protect the souls committed to his care from the Reformed errors with which they came into contact everywhere, and to enable them to confess and defend the Lutheran truth efficiently, he emphasized and preached also the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church. Naturally, his congregation was imbued with the same spirit of sound and determined Lutheranism. "The straitened circumstances of our Dutch Lutherans," says Graebner, "might have suggested to their flesh to seek a better understanding with the Dutch and English Reformed of the city, and to sacrifice some of their Lutheranism, in order to win the friendship as well as the support of these people. Instead, we hear that these Lutherans manfully confessed their Lutheran faith whenever they came in contact with their Reformed compatriots. And Pastor Falckner was repeatedly urged by members of his congregation to compile a booklet for his parishioners in which the chief doctrines, especially the distinctive doctrines concerning which they were often called upon to make confession, would be briefly set forth, to-

gether with the necessary proof-passages. Falckner acceded to these requests. In 1708 he published a book entitled 'Thorough Instruction (Grondlycke Onderricht) concerning Certain Chief Articles of the True, Pure, Saving, Christian Doctrine, Based upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ Himself Being the Chief Corner-stone.' It was the first book to appear from the pen of a Lutheran pastor in America, and till the awakening of Confessional Lutheranism the only uncompromising presentation of Lutheran doctrine. V. E. Loescher praised it as being an "Anti-Calvinistic Compend of Doctrine, Compendium Doctrinae Anti-Calvinianum." The chapter on the "Freedom of the Will," which is embodied in Graebner's *History of the Lutheran Church in America*, be-speaks theological acumen and clarity on the part of the author. In simple catechetical form, together with most appropriate Bible-passages, Falckner presents the following truths: Having lost the divine image, man, by his own natural free will, can neither understand, will, nor do that which is spiritually right, good, and pleasing to God. Man is converted to God and to all that is "thoroughly good" only by the grace and power of God. It is God's pleasure to work in every man in order that he may will and do that which is good. The reason why this is not accomplished in all men is, because many wilfully resist the work of God's grace, despise the means of conversion, and thus, by their own stubborn and evil wills, frustrate the good and gracious will of God. Man has a *free* will; for he does the evil and rejects the good freely and without constraint, without any compulsion on the part of God. Furthermore, in external matters, which reason comprehends, man also has a free will, in a measure. The will of a regenerate Christian is set free, inasmuch as he is able to will that which is pleasing to God, by faith in Jesus Christ, although, in this world, he is not able perfectly to do that which is good. Falckner says: "I conceive this doctrine of free will as follows: All the good which I will and do I ascribe to the grace of God in Christ and to the working of His good Spirit within me, render thanks to Him for it, and watch that I may traffic with the pound of grace, Luke 19, which I have received, in order that more may be given unto me, and that I may receive grace for grace out of the fulness of grace in Jesus Christ. John 1, 16. On the

contrary, all the evil which I will and do I ascribe to my own evil will alone, which maliciously deviates from God and His gracious will, and becomes one with the will of the devil, the world, and sinful flesh. And I am persuaded that if only my own will does not dishonestly, wilfully, and stubbornly resist the converting gracious will of God, He, by His Spirit, will bend and turn it toward that which is good, and, for the sake of Christ's perfect obedience, will not regard, nor impute unto me, the obstinacy cleaving to me by nature." In the introduction of the book, which was written in the Dutch language, Falckner unequivocally professes adherence to the Symbols of the Lutheran Church, the confession of his fathers, "which confession and faith," he says, "by the grace of God and the convincing testimony of His Word and Spirit, also dwell in me, and shall continue to dwell in me until my last, blessed end." (91 ff.)

### JOSHUA KOCHERTHAL.

**22. Palatinates in Quassaic, East and West Camp.**—Wearying of the afflictions which the Thirty Years' War, the persecutions of Louis XIV, and Elector John Wilhelm, who was a tool of the Jesuits, had brought upon them, hosts of Palatinates came to America in quest of liberty and happiness. The cruelties and barbarities which the French king, the French officers, and the French soldiers perpetrated against innocent men, women, and children are described by Macaulay as follows: "The French commander announced to near half a million of human beings that he granted them three days of grace. Soon the roads and fields, which then lay deep in snow, were blackened by innumerable multitudes of men, women, and children flying from their homes. Many died of cold and hunger; but enough survived to fill the streets of all the cities of Europe with lean and squalid beggars, who had once been thriving farmers and shopkeepers. Meanwhile the work of destruction began. The flames went up from every market-place, every hamlet, every parish church, every country seat, within the devoted provinces. The fields where the corn had been sown were plowed up. The orchards were hewn down. No promise of a harvest was left on the fertile plains where had once been Frankenthal. Not a vine, not an almond tree,

was to be seen on the slopes of the sunny hills round what had once been Heidelberg." (Wolf, *Lutherans in America*, 175.) Great numbers of emigrants from Hesse, Baden, and Wuerttemberg whose fate had been similar to that of the Palatinates, joined them. Permission to settle in the New World was sought from the authorities in London, where in 1709, according to various authorities, from ten to twenty thousand Palatines, as they were all designated, were assembled, waiting for an opportunity to emigrate. Joshua Kocherthal, Lutheran pastor at Landau in Bavaria, was the leader of the emigrants from the Palatinate. In 1704 he went to London to make the necessary arrangements. Two years later he published a booklet on the proposed emigration. In 1708 he sailed for the New World with the first fifty-three souls, landing in New York at the close of December, 1708, or the beginning of January, 1709, after a long and stormy voyage lasting about four months. It was the first German Lutheran congregation in the State of New York. After spending the winter in the city, they settled on the right bank of the Hudson, near the mouth of the Quassaic, where Newburgh is now located. Every person received a grant of fifty acres and the congregation five hundred acres of church land, which, however, the British Governor in 1750 awarded to the Episcopalians. In July, 1709, Kocherthal, entrusting his congregation to the care of Falekner, whose acquaintance he had made during the winter in New York, returned to London to obtain, through a personal interview with the Queen, grants of money which were needed to supply the utterly destitute colonists with the necessary means of subsistence until the land was made arable. He returned in June, 1710, with a multitude of emigrants in eleven ships. But, while 3,000 had sailed from London, only 2,200 were destined to reach their homes in the New World, 800 having died while *en route* and in quarantine on Governor's Island. A tract of land comprising 40 acres for each person was assigned to them at the foot of the Catskill Mountains, about 100 miles north of New York. They settled on both sides of the Hudson, naming their settlements East and West Camp, respectively.

**23. Hewing Their Way to the Mohawk Valley.**—The immigrants had been promised prosperity; but the English

officials were actuated by selfish motives and shamefully exploited the colonists. They were ordered to engage in the production of tar and pitch, and were treated as slaves and Redemptioners, *i. e.*, emigrants, shamefully defrauded by "the Newlanders (Neulaender)," as Muhlenberg designated the conscienceless Dutch agents who decoyed Germans from their homes and in America sold them into slavery, at least temporarily. The contract for provisioning the Palatinate colonists was let to Livingston, a cruel and greedy Scot, from whom Governor Hunter had purchased the land on which the Palatinates were settled. Livingston now sought to enrich himself by reducing both the quantity and quality of the food furnished to the colonists. Hunger was common among the settlers, becoming especially acute in winter, as they had not been given sufficient time to plant crops for themselves. Dissatisfaction spread throughout the ranks of the Palatinates, and when the Governor refused to heed their appeal for relief, fifty families left the settlement and hewed their way through the primeval forest to the Mohawk Valley, where they obtained fertile lands from the Indians and founded the Schoharie congregation in the winter of 1712/13. The governor declared the fugitives rebels; but still more followed in March, making their way through three feet of snow. The Lutherans of Schoharie were the first white people to live at peace with the Indians. In order to obtain a clear title to the lands in the Schoharie Valley, which the governor refused to grant them, John Conrad Weiser was sent to England. On his way he was plundered by pirates; in England he was thrown into a sponging house on account of debts. After regaining his liberty, he was compelled to return to Schoharie broken in health and without accomplishing his purpose. The result was that 33 families left Schoharie and settled in Tulpehocken, Pa., in 1723. Among those who remained in West Camp was Pastor Kocherthal. He continued faithfully to serve his congregations, including Schoharie, until his end, December 27, 1719. He lies buried in West Camp. A weather-beaten stone slab marks his resting-place. The inscription calls him "The Joshua and pure Lutheran pastor of the High Germans in America on the east and west bank of the Hudson." In the original the epitaph reads complete as follows: "Wisse Wandersman Unter diesem

Steine ruht nebst seiner Sibylla Charlotte Ein rechter Wandersmann Der Hoch-Teutschen in America ihr Josua Und derselben an Der ost und west seite Der Hudson Rivier rein lutherischer Prediger Seine erste ankunft war mit L'd Lovelace 1707/8 den 1. Januar Seine sweite mit Col. Hunter 1710 d. 14 Juny Seine Englandische reise unterbrach Seine Seelen Himmelsche reise an St. Johannis Tage 1719 Begherstu mehr zu wissen So unter Suche in Welanchtons vaterland Wer war de Kocherthal Wer Harschias Wer Winchenbach B. Berkenmayer S Heurtein L Brevort MDCCXLII." (111.) The successors of Kocherthal were: Justus Falckner, until 1723; Daniel Falckner, the brother of Justus, who had served several German congregations along the Raritan, till 1725; Berkenmeyer; and from 1743 to 1788 Peter N. Sommer, who preached in thirteen other settlements and baptized 84 Indians. He died October 27, 1795. Sommer's aversion to the Halle pastors probably was the reason why he took no part in the organization of the New York Ministerium at Albany in 1786.

#### WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER BERKENMEYER.

**24. Activity in New York.** — In New York Falckner was succeeded by W. Ch. Berkenmeyer (1686—1751). Berkenmeyer was born in the duchy of Lueneburg and had studied theology at Altorf under Dr. Sontag, a theologian whose maxim was, "Quo propius Luther, eo melior theologus, The closer to Luther, the better a theologian." Upon request of the New York congregation the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam, in 1724, called him to serve the Dutch congregations in the Hudson Valley. While *en route* to his new charge, he was informed that a vagabond preacher by the name of J. B. von Dieren, a former tailor, had succeeded in ingratiating himself with the New York Lutherans, and had been accepted as their preacher. Nothing daunted, Berkenmeyer continued his journey, landing at New York in 1725. At the first meeting of the Church Council he won the hearts of all, even of those who had been instrumental in foisting von Dieren upon the congregation, who now stood convicted as an ignorant pretender, and therefore was dismissed. Dieren continued his agitation in other Lutheran congregations until Berkenmeyer in 1728 published

a tract fully exposing the character of the impudent impostor. From the beginning Berkenmeyer's labors were blessed abundantly. Bringing with him money collected by the Lutherans in Amsterdam and receiving additional financial help from London and the congregations of Daniel Falckner, Berkenmeyer was enabled to resume the building operations in New York begun as early as 1670 (1705). On June 29, 1729, the New Trinity Church was dedicated. Berkenmeyer's parish covered a large territory. In addition to New York, Albany, and Loonenburg he served the congregations at Hackensack, Raritan, Clavernack, Newton, West Camp, Tar Bush, Camp, Rheinbeck (where a new church was dedicated on the First Sunday in Advent, 1728), Schenectady, Coxsackie, and in the Schoharie Valley. In Schoharie he baptized the infant daughter of Conrad Weiser, who eighteen years later became the wife of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. In the absence of churches, Berkenmeyer preached in private dwellings or, more frequently, in barns. At one of these services fourteen children were baptized in the "Lutheran barn" of Pieter Lassing. (176.) This immense parish was divided in 1731, Berkenmeyer removing to Loonenburg. Pastor Christian Knoll of Holstein was called to take charge of the southern congregations in and about New York. Berkenmeyer delivered his farewell sermon November 26, 1732, and sixteen days later Knoll preached his first sermon. In 1734 the Lutheran clergy received an addition in the person of Magister Wolff, who succeeded the aged and infirm Daniel Falckner at Raritan and five other congregations in New Jersey. In the same year the three Lutheran pastors and a number of congregations organized the first Lutheran Synod in America, with Berkenmeyer as chairman. Its first and only convention of which we have record was held at Raritan, August 20, 1735; nine congregations were represented by delegates. The chief business of Synod was to settle a quarrel between Wolff and his congregations, one of the charges preferred against the pastor being that he read his sermons instead of delivering them from memory ("statt aus dem Haupte zu predigen"). Peace was restored, but temporarily only. Berkenmeyer continued his ministry in Loonenburg for twenty years. Like other Lutheran divines of his day, the Swedes and Salzburgers

not excepted, he kept two slaves, whom he himself united in marriage in 1744. Also during his declining years Berkenmeyer experienced much sorrow. His end came on August 26, 1751. The closing words of his epitaph are: "He has elected us in Christ before the foundation of the world; there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." In the same year Knoll, who, owing to disputes arising from the language question, had been compelled to resign at New York, took charge of the Loonenburg congregation and continued there until 1765.

**25. Berkenmeyer's Sturdy Lutheranism.** — Though not clear in some points and, at times, rigorous in discipline, Berkenmeyer stood for a sound and decided Lutheranism. His orthodoxy appears from the very library which he selected and brought with him for the congregation in New York, consisting of twenty folios, fifty-two quartos, twenty-three octavos, and six duodecimos, among them Calovius's *Biblia Illustrata*, Balduinus's *Commentarius in Epistolas S. Pauli*, Dedeckennus's *Consilia*, Huelsemann's *De Auxiliis Gratiae*, Brochmand's *Systema*, etc. Owing to his staunch orthodoxy, Berkenmeyer also had an aversion to the Pietists, and refused to cooperate with Muhlenberg and his collaborators from Halle. He disapproved of, and opposed, the unionistic practises of the Swedish and Halle pastors. Speaking of Berkenmeyer's pastorate in New York, Dr. Graebner remarks: "In a firm and faithful manner he had preserved for himself and his congregation, both in doctrine and practise, a staunch Lutheran character, which banished the very thought of fraternizing with the heterodox. At the same time, though a German theologian and commanding an easy, flexible, and forceful Latin, he was a genial Dutchman among his Dutch parishioners, perfectly adapting himself to their manners." (186.) He was firm and consistent, but not fanatical, bigoted, or narrow. "In 1746, when the Reformed pastor Freylinghausen lay ill with the smallpox at Albany, Berkenmeyer visited him. But never did he establish an intimately friendly intercourse with the Reformed pastors, and in church-matters he was determined to keep himself and his people separate from the Reformed. In the German congregations, such as those in and about Newton, where Lutherans lived

among the Reformed, with whom, after suffering together with them, they had emigrated, warnings against apostasy and unionistic practises were even more necessary than in the Dutch congregations, especially, as the Reformed made concessions to Lutherans uniting with them, *e. g.*, by having the Lutheran children recite the Lutheran Catechism in the catechetical instructions of children (*Christenlehren*). Berkenmeyer, however, knew how to keep awake the Lutheran conscience. When, in 1736, the Calvinists on the Katsbaan, several miles from Newton, forbade their lector henceforth to have the children recite the Lutheran Catechism, this led to a declaration on the part of the Lutherans to the effect that they would no longer attend services at their church. At Schoharie, Berkenmeyer had to preach in the Reformed church; but that did not prevent him from testifying against joint services. He declared that in such union, without unity in the faith, the pastor was required to become 'either a dumb dog or a mameluke'; the theme of his sermon here was: 'Our Duty to Defend the Truth against the Gainsayers.' (207.) The same earnestness characterized Berkenmeyer's dealings with pastors, whom he recognized only after they had confessed their Lutheranism in clear and unequivocal terms.

#### DETERIORATION IN NEW YORK.

**26. Germans versus Dutch.** — About 1742 the language question became acute in New York. Dutch immigration had ceased, while Germans arrived in ever increasing numbers. As a result the German communicants in New York outnumbered the Dutch about 8 to 1. As the spokesmen of the German element made unreasonable demands and met with unreasonable opposition on the part of the Dutch, frequent and stormy meetings became the order of the day. Pastor M. C. Knoll had labored faithfully; but, difficulties constantly increasing, he lost control of the situation, and toward the close of 1750 was compelled to resign his charge. Prior to this some of the Germans had withdrawn from Trinity Church, and organized as Christ Church, suffering themselves to be served by unworthy characters, such as J. L. Hofgut, J. F. Ries, P. H. Rapp, J. G. Wiesner, and J. M. Schaeffer. A better element

having come into control, they called men whom H. M. Muhlenberg recommended: I. N. Kurtz, who had been active in Tulpehocken; I. G. Baugher (Bager), who came to America from Helmstedt in 1752, served New York from 1754 to 1767, and died in 1794; J. S. Gerock, who was sent to America by the Consistory of Wuerttemberg in 1755, served in Lancaster, then in New York from 1767 to 1773, and died in 1787; F. C. A. Muhlenberg, educated in Halle, who served Tulpehocken in 1770, New York from 1773 to 1776, and (having fled from New York when the British captured the city in the Revolutionary War) New Hanover in 1777. After 1779 F. C. A. Muhlenberg entered political life, being elected a member of the Continental Congress and Speaker of the Pennsylvania Legislature. He died in 1801. In the Dutch Trinity Church peace was restored by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, who served as Knoll's successor from 1751 to 1753. Muhlenberg cultivated an intimate and fraternal intercourse with the Reformed and Episcopalian pastors, and inaugurated a period of pietism and unionism in New York. On his departure he recommended Pastor J. A. Weygand, who had been serving the Raritan congregations since his arrival, in 1748, from Halle. Weygand remained in New York until 1767. In 1755 he published an English translation of the Augsburg Confession. During his pastorate a parochial school was organized and housed in a building erected for that purpose. He died in 1770. Weygand's successor was Houseal (Hausihl), who had emigrated from Strassburg in 1752. In 1771 he conducted the last service in the Dutch language. In 1776 the church was reduced to ashes by the great fire which destroyed about one-fourth of the city. Though losing all his personal property, he rescued the documents and records of the old congregation. Being an ardent loyalist, he received permission from the British commander to use the Presbyterian church, where his services were also attended by the Hessian troops of the army. When peace was concluded, Houseal emigrated to Halifax, where he was ordained in the Episcopal Church and made chaplain of the garrison. Here he died in 1799.

**27. Union Lauded by Kunze and Schaeffer.**—The two Lutheran congregations in New York reunited in 1783. The

first pastor to serve them was J. C. Kunze. He was born in the vicinity of Mansfeld, received his preparatory education at Halle and other schools, and studied theology at the University of Leipzig. After a brief service in Halle, Kunze was called to be third pastor in Philadelphia. He landed in New York, September 22, 1770, accompanied by two sons of Muhlenberg, who had studied in Halle. In Philadelphia, where he married Muhlenberg's daughter, Kunze conducted a Seminary from 1773 till its close in 1776, and then successively occupied the chairs of Philosophy and of Oriental languages at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1773 this institution awarded him the title of Doctor of Divinity. In the following year he received the call from the reunited Lutheran congregation in New York, which he accepted. He entered upon his new labors with great zeal, and met with no little success, confirming 87 persons in the first six months. Kunze laid especial stress upon the English, which hitherto had been greatly neglected. He also educated young men for the English ministry. A year after his arrival in New York he published "The Rudiments of the Shorter Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther," and ten years later, 1795, the first English Ev. Lutheran Hymn- and Prayer-book. In the same year he issued a new translation of the Small Catechism, containing, besides the six chief parts, also the Christian Questions, 103 fundamental questions, and a "Systematic Presentation of the Order of Salvation." (527.) Kunze was also the first president of the New York Ministerium, organized at Albany in 1786. At his burial, in 1807, the Reformed Pastor Runkel delivered the funeral oration. While a learned man, a hard worker, a man of great influence, a man also who sought to familiarize not only the German, but also the English element of his church with the doctrines of the Catechism, Kunze was not a sound and staunch Lutheran on the order of Berkenmeyer or Falckner. He had no adequate appreciation for the doctrinal differences which separate the Lutherans and the Reformed. In the appendix to his Hymn- and Prayer-book of 1795 Kunze wrote: "That the two Protestant Churches have often shown animosities against one another is true and to be lamented. But that such times are past is a truth more joyful than another, which likewise ought not to be concealed, and [*viz.*] that true piety in the Evangelical

Church stands highly in need of a new and energetic revival, and that it is doubtful in many cases whether the present union of the two churches, which, however, every true Christian will wish to be indissoluble, has its origin in enlightened ideas or in worldly interest, in brotherly love or in indifference." (528.) Kunze's pupil, G. Strebeck, who had been called to preach English in the Old Congregation, organized an English Lutheran Church instead, and in 1804, with a part of his English flock, united with the Episcopal Church. The English congregation now called as its pastor a man who had been excommunicated from the Presbyterian Church on account of Chiliasm, who, in turn, was succeeded by a former Methodist preacher, under whom, in 1810, the entire congregation followed Strebeck into the Episcopalian fold.

**28. Reformation Jubilee in 1817.** — In the mother congregation Kunze, who died 1807, was succeeded by F. W. Geissenhainer. When the latter was no longer able to supply the growing need for English services, F. C. Schaeffer was called in his stead, with the duty expressly imposed upon him of preaching also in English. In 1817, at the tercentenary of the Reformation, Schaeffer arranged a great celebration in which he was assisted by an Episcopalian, a Reformed, and a Moravian pastor. *Dr. Spaeth*: "Here also [in America, as in Prussia] a great Reformation Jubilee was celebrated in 1817. Here also it was, in the first place, of a unionistic character. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania invited the Moravians, Episcopilians, Reformed, and Presbyterians to unite with them in this celebration. In the city of New York the eloquent Lutheran pastor, F. C. Schaeffer, having kept the jubilee in the morning with his own congregation, delivered an English discourse in the afternoon in St. Paul's Episcopal Church on the text, 'I believe, therefore I have spoken.' Thousands were unable to find admittance to the service, so great was the throng." (*C. P. Krauth*, 1, 322.) Rejoicing in the growth of unionism, Schaeffer said in his sermon: "In Germany, the cradle of the Reformation, the 'Protestants' are daily becoming more united in the bond of Christian charity. Whilst the asperities, which indeed too often affected the Great Reformers themselves, no longer give umbrage; whilst the most laudable and beneficial

exertions are universally made by evangelical Christians to remove every sectarian barrier, the 'Evangelical Church,' extending her pale, becomes more firmly established. And though we have melancholy evidence that the state and disposition of the present Romish Church calls loudly for a reformation, we must not omit the pleasing fact that many of her worthy members are conscientiously alive to the cause of truth and enlightened Christianity." (G., 654.) But, instead of more firmly establishing the Lutheran Church, the indifferentism and unionism introduced into New York by the Halle Pietists soon opened wide her gates to a flood of rationalism.

### NEW YORK MINISTERIUM.

**29. Eliminating Confession.** — In 1786 the New York Ministerium was organized in Albany, N. Y., by Pastors Kunze, of New York City, H. Moeller, of Albany, and J. S. Schwerdfeger, of Fellstown, and two lay delegates, one from New York, the other from Albany. Eight of the eleven pastors in this district took no part in the organization. Six years elapsed before another meeting convened. The minutes of the first convention state: "In view of the fact that only three pastors and two delegates appeared, those present considered it advisable to look upon themselves only as a committee of the Lutheran Church in the State of New York." The *Lutheran Cyclopaedia* says: "Though no records prior to the meeting at Albany are extant, Dr. Kunze stated in 1795, and again in 1800, that the New York Ministerium, revived in 1786, had been organized as early as 1773 by F. A. C. Muhlenberg, then pastor in New York." (490.) *Dr. Jacobs*: "Concerning the fact that any meeting was actually held, we are in ignorance; but Dr. Kunze, who ought to be most competent authority, declares: 'To the late Dr. Henry Muhlenberg belongs the immortal honor of having formed in Pennsylvania a regular ministry, and, what is somewhat remarkable, to one of his sons, who officiated as Lutheran minister from the year 1773 to 1776 in the city of New York, that of having formed the Evangelical Ministry of New York State.' The thought was carried out in 1786." (300.) In a letter to his father, then visiting in Georgia, F. A. C. Muhlenberg mentions a meeting of the Lutheran ministers in

the Province of New York, planned for April, 1774. (Graebner, 450.) The Ministerium organized at Albany was a duplicate of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. According to the Minutes a resolution was adopted to regard "the constitution of the Ev. Luth. Church of Pennsylvania as their law." (469.) In 1792 the New York Ministerium adopted the new constitution of the Pennsylvania Synod, which contained no reference to the Lutheran Confessions whatever, merely retaining the name Lutheran. At the convention in Rheinbeck, 1797, Dr. Kunze being the leading spirit and president, the New York Ministerium passed the notorious resolution: "Resolved, That, on account of the intimate relation subsisting between the English Episcopalian and Lutheran Churches, the identity of their doctrine, and the near approach of their church-discipline, this consistory will never acknowledge a newly erected Lutheran church in places where the members may partake of the services of the said English Episcopal Church." (528.) Seven years later this resolution was rescinded, not, indeed, for confessional reasons, but in the interest of expediency and policy, because in 1804 G. Strebeck, with a part of his English congregation in New York, had been received by the Episcopalian. Spaeth remarks with respect to the Rheinbeck resolution: "A fitting parallel to this resolution is found in the advances made by the Mother Synod of Pennsylvania toward a union with the German Reformed Church, first in 1819 for the joint establishment of a common Theological Seminary, and afterward, in 1822, for a general union with the Evangelical Reformed Church. See Minutes of 1822." (*C. P. Krauth*, 1, 320.)

**30. President Quitman the Rationalist.** — The unionism and indifferentism of the New York Ministerium naturally developed and merged into Socinianism and Rationalism under its liberal, but most able and influential leader, Dr. F. H. Quitman (1760—1832). "Quitman," says Graebner, "was a stately person, over six feet in height and of correspondingly broad and powerful build. Already at his entrance in Halle, one of the professors greeted the nineteen-year-old giant with the words, 'Quanta ossa! Quantum robur! What bones! What power!'" In his subsequent intercourse with the polite world Quitman acquired a fine tact and measured, dignified ways. At the same

time he was a man of excellent parts, a master at repartee, with a keen intellect and a firm will, and in every respect a born leader." (532.) He was the only Lutheran minister who ever received, and perhaps desired [?] to receive, the degree of D. D. from Harvard University. Quitman, a disciple of Teller and of Semler in Halle, was a determined protagonist of German Rationalism. In 1807 this outspoken and consistent Socinian was elected president of the New York Ministerium, remaining in this office till 1825. When Quitman accepted the call to the Schoharie congregations, which he served beginning with the year 1795, he vowed that he would preach the truth according to the Word of God and "our Symbolical Books." Before long, however, he began to reveal the true inwardness of his character. In his revised edition of Kunze's catechism, which appeared in 1804, authorized by Synod, the 94th of the "Fundamental Questions," which treated of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, was omitted. Ten years later, 1814, in his own catechism, which was likewise published with the approval of Synod, he omitted and denied such fundamental doctrines as those of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, the Vicarious Atonement, Justification for the sake of Christ, etc. In this book Quitman and the New York Ministerium declare: "The Gospel teaches us that Christ suffered and died in order to seal with His blood the doctrine which He had preached." (533.) Two years later a "Lutheran Hymn-book" appeared, containing an un-Lutheran order of service, the Union formula of distribution, a rationalistic order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, rationalistic prayers to the "great Father of the Universe," etc. Also this book appeared "by order of the Ev. Luth. Ministerium of the State of New York," and with a preface signed by President Quitman and Pastor Wackerhagen. (535.) When the tercentenary of the Reformation was celebrated, Quitman, again by order of the New York Ministerium, published several sermons bearing on this event. Here he says: "Reason and Revelation are the only sources from which religious knowledge can be drawn, and the norms according to which all religious questions ought to be decided. . . . Are not both, Reason and Revelation, from heaven, always in agreement and the one supporting the other?" Again: "The true

sense which the Reformers connected with the term 'faith' is still more apparent from the XX. Article of the Augsburg Confession, where they explicitly declare that faith 'which is productive of good works justifies man before God.' " (653.) This rank Socinianism and Rationalism of Quitman and the Ministerium became firmly intrenched and was protected from attack by the constitution of 1816, which contained the paragraph: "And we establish it as a fundamental rule of this association that the person to be ordained shall not be required to make any other engagement than this, that he will faithfully teach, as well as perform all other ministerial duties, and regulate his walk and conversation, according to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ as contained in Holy Scriptures, and that he will observe this constitution while he remains a member of this Ministerium." (655.) Within the New York Ministerium, therefore, ministers could no longer be required by their congregations to pledge themselves on the Lutheran Confessions. According to the constitution doctrinal discussions were permitted on the floor of Synod, but only with the express proviso "that the fundamental principle of Protestantism, the right of free research, be not infringed upon, and that no endeavor be made to elevate the Ministerium to an inquisitorial tribunal." (679.) Thus the entire heritage of the Reformation, together with its Scriptural principle and cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, had gone by the board, the unionism and indifferentism of the Halle pastors having served as the first entering wedge — just as in Halle Pietism and subjectivism, an essentially Reformed growth, foreign to sound objective Lutheranism, had given birth to the ugly child, afterwards, when grown up, named *Rationalismus Vulgaris*.

#### JOHN CHRISTOPHER HARTWICK.

31. **The Eccentric Wandering Bachelor.** — Hartwick (Hartwig, Hartwich, Hardwick) was born 1714 in Thuringia, Saxony. Coming to New York in 1746, Berkenmeyer had him subscribe to the Loonenburg Church constitution. His parish included the congregations at Rheinbeck, Camp, Staatsburg, Ancrum, and Tar Bush. The capriciousness with which Hartwick, who remained an eccentric bachelor all his life, performed

his pastoral duties soon gave rise to dissatisfaction. Complaints were lodged against him with Berkenmeyer, who finally wrote against him publicly. In 1750 Muhlenberg conducted a visitation in Hartwick's congregations, and reports as follows: "He went to Pennsylvania too often, and that without the permission of his congregations, etc. He did not sufficiently prepare the young for confirmation, by simple instruction in the Catechism; is too austere in his dealings with the people; does not always permit them to see him; does not maintain order at public worship; begins services an hour or two after the time fixed; has long hymns sung and preaches long, so that those who come from a distance must drive till late into the night and are compelled to neglect their cattle. He is headstrong (koppich), that is, self-willed, and will not allow any one to tell him anything or to give him advice. He says he did not come here to learn from the people, but to teach them. Nor did he, said they, cultivate the friendship of the old spiritual father Berkenmeyer, while pastors were to set a good example. Such and similar were the complaints made by his opponents." (G., 412.) The upshot of the deliberations was that Raus was appointed vicar of the congregations, while Hartwick agreed to spend six months in Pennsylvania, where he previously, 1748, had participated in the organization of the Pennsylvania Synod. In 1752 Hartwick preached to the Dutch congregation of New York, an honor that was denied him in 1750 because of his hostility to Berkenmeyer. January 8, 1751, Hartwick addressed a pastoral letter to his congregations, in which he not only displays a lack of Lutheran knowledge, but also refers to Berkenmeyer as "brother Esau" and speaks of his opponents as "Edomites" and "Esauites." In the spring of 1751 Hartwick returned to his congregations. When it became impossible for him to maintain his position any longer, he went to Reading, in 1757. In the following year he returned to Columbia and Duchess Co., N. Y. Subsequently, wandering about aimlessly, he was seen, now in Hackensack and Providence, now (1761) as Muhlenberg's successor in the country congregations, then in Maryland, 1763 in Philadelphia, then in Winchester, Va., 1767 in New York, attending the unionistic church dedication, 1774 in Boston, and ten years later again in New York, whither he returned to ingratiate himself with

the Lutherans who had not emigrated to Nova Scotia with Houseal. Known everywhere, but at home nowhere, and usually an unwelcome guest, Hartwick died suddenly, July 16, 1796, at East Camp. The last lines of the dreary inscription on his tombstone are: "The brief span of our days is seventy to eighty years, and though it was ever so precious, its sum is trouble and sorrow. On the wings of time we hasten to a long eternity." In the original the epitaph reads as follows: "Hier ruhet Johann C. Hartwick Prediger der Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche. gebohren in Sax Gotha de 6 Jenner 1714 Gestorben den 16 Julius 1796 Seines alters 82 Jahre 6 Monat.— Das kurzgesteckte Ziel der Tage Ist siebenzig is achtzig jahr Ein innbegrif von muh und plague Auch wenn es noch so kostlich war. Geflugelt eilt mit uns die zeit In eine lange ewigkeit." (657.)

**32. Hartwick Seminary and Dr. Hazelius.** — In 1754 Hartwick purchased 21,500 acres of land in Otsego Co., N. Y., which he endeavored to colonize with a Lutheran congregation. "The lease was to contain a clause pledging every colonist to unite with the church within a year; to recognize Pastor Hartwick or his representative as his pastor and spiritual adviser; to attend his services regularly, decently, and with devotion; to contribute to the maintenance of the church, school, and parsonage according to ability; to have his children baptized, and to send them to school and confirmation instruction until they were confirmed. The validity of the lease was to depend on the fulfilment of these conditions." (454.) The plan failed, and Hartwick, in a will, executed shortly before his death, left his estate, valued at about \$17,000, to found a theological seminary. Among the conditions were that heathen authors should never be read in this institution, and that a catechism be prepared and agreed upon by pastors of various churches, in which, all controversial points being avoided, the essential questions of the Christian religion were to be answered by classic Bible-verses containing the Christian doctrines. A request was appended to the will, in which Congress was asked to promote in every possible way the undertaking planned by him "in the interest of humanizing, civilizing, moralizing, and Christianizing, not only the aborigines of North America, but all other

barbarous peoples with whom the United States may have connection or intercourse." (658.) In 1797 the income of Hartwick's estate was used to pay Dr. J. C. Kunze, of New York, for his theological instruction, Rev. A. T. Braun, of Albany, for instruction in the classics, and Rev. J. F. Ernst for teaching the children on the patent (Otsego County) where the seminary was to be located. The foundation for a building was laid in 1812, which was dedicated December 15, 1815, and opened by Dr. Hazelius and A. Quitman (later renowned as a lawyer, statesman, and general) with 19 students. A charter was obtained in 1816 containing the provision that the director must always be a Lutheran theologian, and that the majority of the trustees must be Lutherans. When the English congregations separated from the New York Ministerium in 1867, Hartwick Seminary remained in their hands. In 1871 the trustees requested the Franckean, Hartwick, New York, and New Jersey Synods each to nominate three trustees, the institution thus coming under the control of these synods. The first director of Hartwick Seminary was Dr. Hazelius, who was born in Silesia in 1777, and educated at the institution of the Moravians in Germany. He came to America in 1800 and was made instructor in the classics at the Moravian institution at Nazareth, Pa. Before long he was employed in the theological department. In 1809, Hazelius was ordained as Lutheran pastor of Germantown. He was connected with Hartwick Seminary for fifteen years, when he was called to Gettysburg Seminary. Three years later (1833) he accepted a call to the seminary of the South Carolina Synod at Lexington, where he died in 1853. Hazelius, who did not leave the Moravians for doctrinal reasons, held that Lutherans and Reformed do not differ fundamentally. Accordingly, he also approved of distributing the Lord's Supper at the same altar, to Lutherans according to their practise, to others in the manner of the Reformed. The minutes of the proceedings of the General Synod held at Winchester, Va., May 21, 1853, record the following: "Whereas, It has pleased the God of all and Head of the Church to remove from this transitory scene, and to take home to Himself, our venerable and beloved father in Christ, the Rev. Ernest Lewis Hazelius, D. D., we, who have been privileged to sit at his feet, and to be instructed by him in the various departments of sacred

service, desire to unite in a public expression of our grief at his departure from among us, and of our high regard for his name and memory; therefore, Resolved, That we duly appreciate and gratefully acknowledge the importance, efficiency, and happy results of his long, faithful, and untiring labors as a minister of our Church; first a pastor, then, for fifteen years, as the first professor and principal of Hartwick Seminary, afterwards as professor at the Theological Seminary of this body at Gettysburg, for two years, and, lastly, up to October, 1852, as Professor of Theology at Lexington, in the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina." (44.)

### GERMANTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA.

**33. Early Germans in America.** — In the Colonial days, next to the English, the Germans were foremost in settling and developing our country. Long before the Puritans thought of emigrating to America, Germans had landed in various parts of the New World. As early as 1538, J. Cromberger established a printing-office in the City of Mexico, from which he issued numerous books. From 1528 to 1546 German explorers came to Venezuela also with a printing-press and with fifty miners to explore the mountains. A number of German craftsmen accompanied the first English settlers who came with Captain John Smith to Virginia. Soon after Henry Hudson had discovered the river which bears his name, Christiansen, a German, became the explorer of that stream. He also built the first homes on Manhattan Island, 1613, and laid the foundations of New Amsterdam and Fort Nassau, the present cities of New York and Albany. Peter Minuit (Minnewit), the first Director-General of New Netherland, was also a German, born in Wesel, on the lower Rhine. He arrived in New Amsterdam on May 4, 1626, and one of his first acts was the purchase of Manhattan Island, 22,000 acres, from the Indians for trinkets valued at \$24. He remained at his post till 1631, when he, soon after, became the founder and first director of New Sweden, at the mouth of the Delaware River. He lost his life in the West Indies during a hurricane. His successor in New Sweden was another German, Printz von Buchau, during whose *régime*, from 1643 to 1654, the colony became very successful

and thereby aroused the jealousy of the Dutch, who, while Buchau was on a trip to Europe, attacked the colony and annexed it to New Netherland. When New Netherland, in 1664, fell a prey to the English, the colony had among its citizens numerous Germans, most of them Lutherans. A native of Hamburg, Nicholaus de Meyer, became burgomaster of New York in 1676. Another German, Augustin Herrman, made the first reliable maps of Maryland and Virginia. J. Lederer, a young German scholar, who came to Jamestown in 1668, was the first to explore Virginia and part of South Carolina. Lederer's itinerary, written in Latin, was translated by Governor Talbot of Maryland into English and published 1672 in London; etc. However, it was at Germantown, at present a suburb of Philadelphia, that Germans broke ground for the first permanent German settlement in North America. A group of Mennonites, 33 persons, landed October 6, 1683. They were received by William Penn and Franz Daniel Pastorius, a young lawyer from Frankfort on the Main. In Germantown Gerhard Henkel preached before 1726, and St. Michael's Church was begun 1730 and dedicated by the Swede J. Dylander in 1737. Pastorius had landed in America with several families on August 20 of the same year in advance of the Mennonite emigrants, in order to prepare for their arrival. The official seal of Germantown bore the inscription: "Vinum, Linum et Textrinum," the culture of grapes, flax-growing, and the textile industries being the principal occupations of the colony. In 1690 W. Rittenhaus established in Germantown the first paper-mill in America. Here also Christopher Sauer, a native of Westphalia, published the first newspaper in German type, and in 1743 the first German Bible, antedating, by forty years, the printing of any other Bible in America. The Germans in the cloister Ephrata, Pa., established by the Tunker, or Dunkards, also owned a printing-press, a paper-mill, and a bookbindery. They published, in 1749, the *Maertyrer-Spiegel*, a folio of 1514 pages, the greatest literary undertaking of the American Colonies. To the Germans enumerated must be added the German Reformed; the Moravians, who founded Bethlehem and Nazareth in Pennsylvania; the Salzburgers in Georgia; the Palatines in New York; etc. And what may be said of Germantown, is true also with regard to Philadelphia. June 6,

1734, Baron von Reck wrote concerning the conglomerate community of this city: "It is an abode of all religions and sects, Lutherans, Reformed, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Catholics, Quakers, Dunkards, Mennonites, Sabbatarians, Seventh-day Baptists, Separatists, Boehmists, Schwenkfeldians, Tuchifelder, Wohlwuenscher, Jews, heathen, etc." (Jacobs, 191.) Concerning the thrifty character and all-round good citizenship of the German immigrants in Pennsylvania generally, McMaster remarks: "Wherever a German farmer lived, there were industry, order, and thrift. The size of the barns, the height of the fences, the well-kept wheat-fields and orchards, marked off the domain of such farmer from the lands of his shiftless Irish neighbor." "They were," says Scharf in his *History of Maryland*, 2, 423, "an industrious, frugal, temperate people, tilling their farms, accustomed to conflict with savage and other enemies on the border, and distinguished for their bold and independent spirit." (Jacobs, 235.) Also in the cause of liberty and humanity the German immigrants in America stood in the front ranks.

**34. First Anti-Slavery Declaration in America.** — The importation of negro slaves to America was practised by the English and Dutch since the sixteenth century, without disapproval on the part of the Puritans and Quakers, who boasted of being the fathers of liberty and the defenders of human rights. The inhabitants of Germantown, led by Pastorius, were the first to draw up, on February 18, 1688, a protest against this trade in human flesh and blood. The remarkable document, addressed to the meeting of the Quakers in Pennsylvania, reads as follows: "This is to ye Monthly Meeting held at Richard Warrel's. These are the reasons why we are against the traffick of men Body, as followeth: Is there any that would be done or handled at this manner? to be sold or made a slave for all the time of his life? How fearful and fainthearted are many on sea when they see a strange vessel, being afraid it should be a Turk, and they should be taken and sold for slaves into Turckey. Now what is this better done as Tureks doe? Yea rather is it worse for them, which say they are Christians; for we hear that ye most part of such Negers are brought hither against their will and consent; and that many of them

are stollen. Now, tho' they are black, we cannot conceive there is more liberty to have them slaves, as it is to have other white ones. There is a saying, that we shall doe to all men, like as we will be done our selves; making no difference of what generation, descent or colour they are. And those who steal or robb men, and those who buy or purchase them, are they not all alike? Here is liberty of conscience, which is right and reasonable; here ought to be likewise liberty of ye body, except of evildoers which is another case. But to bring men hither, or to robb and sell them against their will, we stand against. In Europe there are many oppressed for conscience sake; and here there are those oppressed which are of a black colour. And we, who know that men must not commit adultery, some doe commit adultery in others, separating wifes from their husbands and giving them to others; and some sell the children of those poor creatures to other men. Oh! doe consider well this things, you who doe it; if you would be done at this manner? and if it is done according to Christianity? You surpass Holland and Germany in this thing. This makes an ill report in all those countries of Europe, where they hear off, that ye Quakers doe here handel men like they handel there ye cattel. And for that reason some have no mind or inclination to come hither, and who shall maintaine this your cause or plaid for it? Truly we can not do so, except you shall inform us better hereoff, that Christians have liberty to practise this things. Pray! What thing on the world can be done worse towards us, then if men should robb or steal us away, and sell us for slaves to strange countries, separating housbands from their wifes and children. Being now this is not done at that manner, we will be done at, therefore we contradict and are against this traffick of menbody. And we who profess that it is not lawful to steal, must likewise avoid to purchase such things as are stollen but rather help to stop this robbing and stealing if possible; and such men ought to be delivered out of ye hands of ye Robbers and sett free as well as in Europe. Then is Pennsylvania to have a good report, instead it hath now a bad one for this sacke in other countries. Especially whereas ye Europeans are desirous to know in what manner ye Quakers doe rule in their Province; and most of them doe

look upon us with an envious eye. But if this is done well, what shall we say is done evill? If once these slaves (which they say are so wicked and stubborn men) should joint themselves, fight for their freedom and handel their masters and mastrisses as they did handel them before, will these masters and mastrisses tache the sword at hand and warr against these poor slaves, like we are able to believe, some will not refuse to doe? Or have these Negers not as much right to fight for their freedom, as you have to keep them slaves? Now consider well this thing, if it is good or bad? and in case you find it to be good to handel these blacks at that manner, we desire and require you hereby lovingly, that you may inform us here in, which at this time never was done, that Christians have such a liberty to do so, to the end we shall be satisfied in this point, and satisfie likewise our good friends and acquaintances in our natif country, to whose it is a terrour or fairfull thing that men should be handeld so in Pennsylvania. This is from our Meeting at Germantown held ye 18. of the 2. month 1688, to be delivered to the monthly meeting at Richard Warrel's. gerret hendericks derick op de graeff Francis Daniell Pastorius Abraham op Den graeff." (Cronau, *German Achievements*, 20.) This protest was submitted at several meetings of the Quakers. But it was not before 1711 that the Quakers introduced "an act to prevent the importation of Negroes and Indians into the province," and still later that they declared against slave-trading. Also the Salzburgers in Georgia were opposed to slavery, though Bolzius himself was compelled to buy slaves on account of the lack of white laborers. The Germans also were first and most emphatic in condemning the cruelties connected with the "white slavery" of the so-called Redemptioners.

### SLAVERY OF REDEMPTIONERS.

**35. Cruelly Deceived by the Newlanders.** — Toward the middle of the eighteenth century there were some 80,000 Germans in Pennsylvania, almost one-half of the entire inhabitants. In 1749 about 12,000 arrived. Benjamin Franklin and others expressed the fear: "They come in such numbers that they will soon be able to enforce their laws and language upon us, and, uniting with the French, drive all Englishmen out." Many of

the Germans were so-called Redemptioners, who, in payment of their freight, were sold and treated as slaves for a stipulated number of years. Most of them had been shamefully deceived and decoyed into the horrors of this "white slavery" by Dutch and English merchants and conscienceless agents whom Muhlenberg called Newlanders (Neulaender). In Holland they were called "soul-traders." By means of stories of the fabulous wealth acquired in America they enticed Germans and other emigrants into the signing of papers in the English language which not only committed them and their children to slavery, but sometimes separated husband and wife, parents and children. The following is an instance of the revolting horrors connected with this trade: In 1793, when the yellow fever prevailed in Chester, a cargo of Redemptioners was sent thither, and a market for nurses opened. (Jacobs, 236.) In Pennsylvania this kind of slavery continued from about 1740 to the second decade of the nineteenth century. Quakers and other "friends of liberty and humanity" exploited the system. Foremost among those who exposed and condemned it were Germans, notably Muhlenberg, who described the abominable business of the Newlanders as follows: "These Newlanders first make themselves acquainted with the merchants in the Netherlands. From them they receive, in addition to free freight, a certain gratification (*douceur*) for each family or each unmarried person which they enlist in Germany and bring to the traders in Holland. In order to attain their object, they resort to all manner of tricks. As long as the comedy requires it, they make a great show in dress, frequently look at their watches, and make a pretense of great wealth, in order to excite a desire within the hearts of people to emigrate to so happy and rich a country. They give such descriptions of America as make one believe it to contain nothing but Elysian fields, bearing seed of themselves, without toil and labor, mountains full of solid gold and silver, and wells pouring forth nothing but milk and honey, etc. Who goes as a servant, becomes a lord; who goes as a maid, becomes a milady; a peasant becomes a nobleman; a citizen and artisan, a baron!" Deceived and allured by such stories, Muhlenberg continues, "the families break up, sell what little they have, pay their debts, turn over what may be left to the Newlanders for safe-

keeping, and finally start on their journey. Already the trip on the Rhine is put to their account. In Holland they are not always able to depart immediately, and frequently they get a small amount of money, advanced by the traders, on their account. The expensive freight from Holland to America is added, also the head-money. Before they leave Holland, they must sign a contract in the English language. The Newlanders persuade and reassure the people [who, not understanding the English, knew not what they were signing] that they, as impartial friends, would see to it that, in the contract, no wrong was done their countrymen. The more freight in persons a merchant and captain can bring in a ship, the more profitable it is, provided that they do not die *en route*, for then it may be disadvantageous. For this reason the ships are kept clean, and every means is employed to deliver healthy ware to the market. For a year or so they may not have been as careful, suffering to die what could not live. When parents die on the ships and leave children, the captains and the most intelligent of the Newlanders, acting as guardians and orphan-fathers, take the chests and inheritance in their safe-keeping, and the orphans, arriving on the land, are sold for their own freight and the freight of their deceased parents; the real little ones are given away, and the inheritance of their parents just about pays for the manifold troubles caused to the guardians. This crying deceit moved some well-disposed German inhabitants of Pennsylvania, especially in and about Philadelphia, to organize a society, which, as much as possible, would see to it that, at the arrival of the poor emigrants, they were dealt with according to justice and equity." When a ship of emigrants has arrived in the harbor of Philadelphia, Muhlenberg proceeds, "the newcomers are led in procession to the court-house, in order to take the oath of allegiance to the King of Great Britain; then they are led back to the ship. Hereupon the papers announce that so and so many German people are to be sold for their freight. Whoever is able to pay his own freight receives his freedom. Those having wealthy friends endeavor to obtain a loan from them to pay the freight; but these are few. The ship is the market. The buyers pick out some and bargain with them as to the years and days of service, whereupon they make them bind themselves before the

magistrate by a written instrument for a certain period as their property. The young, unmarried people of both sexes sell first, their lot being a good or a bad one, for better or worse, according to the character of the buyer and God's providence or permission. We have frequently noted that children who were disobedient to their parents, and left them stubbornly and against their will, here found masters from whom they received their reward. Old and married people, widows and the frail, nobody wants to buy, because there is here already an abundance of poor and useless people who become a burden to the state. But if they have healthy children, then the freight of the old people is added to that of the children, and the children must serve so much longer, are sold so much dearer, and scattered far and wide from each other, among all manner of nations, languages, and tongues, so that they rarely see their old parents or brothers and sisters again in this life; many also forget their mother-tongue. In this way the old people leave the ship free, but poor, naked, and weak, looking as though they were coming from the graves, and go begging in the city at the doors of the German inhabitants; for, as a rule, the English, afraid of infection, close the doors on them. Such being the conditions, one's heart might bleed seeing and hearing how these poor human beings, who came from Christian lands into the New World, partly moan, cry, lament, and throw up their arms because of the misery and separation which they had never imagined would befall them, partly call upon and adjure all elements and sacraments, yea, all thunderbolts and the terrible inhabitants of hell to smash into numberless fragments and torment the Newlanders and the Dutch merchants, who deceived them! Those who are far away hear nothing of it, and the properly so-called Newlanders only laugh about it, and give them no other consolation beyond that given to Judas Iscariot by the Pharisees, Matt. 27, 4: 'What is that to us? See thou to that!' Even the children, when they are cruelly kept and learn that they must remain in bondage all the longer on account of their parents, conceive a hatred and bitterness toward them." (G., 474 ff.)

**36. Mittelberger on Redemptioners.** — Mittelberger, who, in 1750, brought to America the organ built at Heil-

bronn for the Lutheran church in Philadelphia, and served Muhlenberg also as schoolteacher in Providence, describes, in substance, the sad lot of the Redemptioners as follows: "Healthy and strong young people were bound to serve from three to six years, young people from their tenth to their twenty-first year. Many parents, in order to obtain their freedom, must themselves bargain about and sell their own children like cattle. A wife must bear the freight of her husband if he arrives sick; in like manner the husband is held for his sick wife; thus he must serve not only for himself, but, in addition, five or six years for his sick spouse. When both are sick, they are brought into the hospital, but only when no buyer is found. As soon as they are well, they must serve in payment of their freight, or pay, if they have property. It frequently happens that a whole family, husband, wife, and children, being sold to different buyers, are separated, especially if they are unable to pay anything on their freight themselves. When a spouse dies on the ocean after one-half of the voyage is completed, the remaining spouse must not only pay or serve for himself, but also for the freight of the deceased one. When both parents die on the ocean, their children must serve for their own and their parents' freight till their twenty-first year. If anybody escapes a cruel master, he cannot get very far, since good provisions are made for the certain and speedy recapture of escaped Redemptioners. A liberal reward is paid to him who holds or returns a deserter. If a deserter was absent for a day, he must serve a week for it; for a week, a month; and for a month, half a year. Men of rank, skill, or learning, unable to pay their freight, or to give any surety, must serve their masters by doing manual labor like ordinary servants. While learning to perform the unaccustomed hard labor, they are treated with lashes like cattle. Many a suicide was the consequence of the abominable deceit of the Newlanders. Others sank into utter despair, or deserted, only to suffer more afterwards than before. Sometimes the merchants in Holland make a secret agreement to deliver their cargo of human beings not in Philadelphia, where they wanted to go, but at some other place, where they expect a better market, thus robbing many of the assistance of their friends and relatives in Pennsylvania. Many entrust their money to

the Newlanders, who remain in Holland, and on their arrival in this country they must either serve themselves, or sell their children to serve for them." (477 ff.) Like the negroes, the Redemptioners could be resold. The newspapers carried advertisements like the following from the *Staatsbote* of Philadelphia: "The time of service of a bond-maid is for sale. She is tall and strong enough to do any kind of work, and is able to perform work in the city as well as in the country. She is not sold on account of a physical defect, but only because her master has many women folks about. She has yet to serve for four and a half years. The name of her owner may be learned from the publisher of this paper." (481.) As with the negro slaves the lot of a Redemptioner was not in every case physically a sad and cruel one. In Maryland the laws protected them by limiting the days of work in summer to five and a half a week, and demanding for them three hours of rest in the middle of the day during the months of greatest heat. In 1773 Pastor Kunze wrote: "If I should ever obtain 20 pounds, I would buy the first German student landing at our coast and owing freight, put him in my upper room, begin a small Latin school, teach during the morning hours myself, and then let my servant teach and make my investment pay by charging a small fee." (481.) Some of the honored names in American history are those of Redemptioners, among them Charles Thomson, the Secretary of Congress during the Revolution, Matthew Thornton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and the parents of Major-General Sullivan. (Jacobs, 235.)

#### LUTHERANS IN PENNSYLVANIA.

**37. Roaming About without Altar and Ministry.** — Justus Falckner, in a letter to Dr. H. Muhlen, dated August 1, 1701, describes the "spiritual wilderness" in and about Germantown as follows: "As much, then, as I was able to observe the conditions of the churches in these parts and in particular in this province, they are still pretty bad. Because of the lack of any good preparations the aborigines, or Indians, remain in their blindness and barbarism. In addition to this they are scandalized by the wicked life of the Christians, and especially by the trade carried on with them, and merely acquire vices

which were unknown to them before, such as drunkenness, theft, etc. The few Christians here are divided in almost innumerable sects, which *κατ' εξοχήν* may be called sects and rabbles, such as Quakers, Anabaptists, Naturalists, Libertinists, Independentists, Sabbatarians, and many others, especially secretly spreading sects, regarding whom we are at a loss what to make of them. However, all of them agree in their beautiful principles (si Dis placet): Abolish all good order, and live for yourself as you see fit. The Quakers are the most numerous because the Governor [William Penn] belongs to them, so that one might call this land an anatomical laboratory of Quakers. For much as our theologians have labored to dissect this cadaver and discover its entrails, they, nevertheless, have not been able to do it as well as the Quakers are now doing it themselves in this country. It would fill a whole tract if, as could be done easily, I were to describe how they, by transgressing their own principles, make it apparent what kind of a spirit is moving them, while they, by virtue of the foundation of such principles, are scoffers and Ishmaels of all well-ordered church-life. *Hic Rhodus, hic saltant* (Here is Rhodes, here they dance). "Also here" (as in Europe), Falckner proceeds, "the Protestant Church is divided in three nations; for there is here an English Protestant Church, a Swedish Protestant Lutheran Church, and people of the German nation belonging to the Evangelical Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. The Swedes have two congregations. . . . But not without reason have I spoken of the Germans merely as some Evangelical Lutheran Germans and not the German Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as they are roaming about in this desert without altar and the ministry (scilicet qui arā sacerdotuque destituti vagantur hoc in deserto), a miserable condition, indeed. Otherwise there is a great number of Germans here. But a part of them have joined the other sects, who use the English language, which is learned first by all who come here, and some of them are Quakers and Anabaptists. Another part of them are freethinkers, uniting with nobody and letting their children grow up in the same way. In brief, there are Germans here, and probably the most of them, who despise God's Word and all good outward order, blaspheme and frightfully and publicly desecrate the Sacraments. *Spiritus enim*

errorum et sectarum asylum sibi hic constituit (For the spirit of errors and sects has here established his asylum). And the chief fault and cause of this is the lack of provision for an external visible church-communion. For since, as it were, the first thesis of natural theology, inborn in all men, is 'Religiosum quendam cultum observandum, A certain religious cult must be observed,' it happens that these people, when they come here and find no better external service, elect any one rather than none. For though they are Libertinists, nevertheless also Libertinism is not without its outward form, by which it makes itself a specific religion in none of them." Falckner proceeds: "I and my brother [Daniel] attend the Swedish church, although, as yet, we understand little of the language. And by our example we have induced several Germans to come to their meetings occasionally, even though they did not understand the language, and for the purpose only of gradually drawing them out of barbarism and accustoming them to outward order, especially as one of the Swedish pastors, Mr. M. Rudman, for the sake of love and the glory of God, offered to go to the trouble of learning the German language and occasionally to deliver a German address in the Swedish church, until the Germans could have a church of their own." In the following Falckner dwells on the great help it would afford in attracting the Indians and the children of the Quakers and drawing the young Swedes to the services if an organ could be installed in the Swedish church. (G. Fritschel, *Geschichte*, 35 ff.) The miserable condition spiritually of the Lutherans in Pennsylvania appears from a letter of their representatives to Dr. Ziegenhagen in London, dated October, 1739, in which they state: "There is not one German Lutheran preacher in the whole land, except Caspar Stoever, now sixty miles distant from Philadelphia." (Jacobs, 191.)

**38. New Hanover, Philadelphia, Providence.** — It was a motley crowd of Germans that gathered in the land of the Quakers. Indeed, Pastorius, the first mayor of Germantown, was a rather moderate pietist from the circles of Spener, but, as stated above, with him and after him came Mennonites, Tunkers, Moravians, Gichtelians, Schwenkfeldians, disciples of the cobbler of Goerlitz, Jacob Boehme, and enthusiasts who as

yet had no name. (G., 242.) Before long, however, the Lutherans outnumbered all other German denominations (Moravians and German Reformed) and sects in the Quaker State, to which they came in increasingly large numbers, especially after the sad experiences of the Palatinates in New York. By 1750 the number of Germans in Pennsylvania was estimated at 60,000, of whom about two-thirds were Lutherans by birth. Though imbued with apocalyptic and mystical ideas, H. B. Koester, who arrived in 1694 with forty families, is said to have conducted the first German Lutheran services in Germantown. Before long he united with the Episcopalians and founded Christ Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, but returned to Germany in 1700. Daniel Falckner, who had emigrated with Koester, opposed the Quakers in Germantown. In Falckner's Swamp (New Hanover), he organized the first German Lutheran congregation in Pennsylvania, and is said to have erected a log church as early as 1704. In his struggle against the mismanagement of Pastorius, Falckner, in 1708, fell a prey to intrigues. A disappointed man he went to New Jersey, where he served the congregations at Raritan, Muehlstein, Rockaway, and other points, and from 1724 to 1725 also the settlements which Kocherthal had served along the Hudson. Owing to his increasing mental weakness, Daniel Falckner, in 1731, resigned his field in favor of J. A. Wolff. He died at Raritan ten years later. In New Hanover Gerhard Henkel, the first Lutheran pastor in Virginia, continued the work from 1717 to 1728. In Philadelphia J. C. Schulz, of Wuerttemberg, was the first Lutheran pastor of whom we have any knowledge. Educated in Strassburg, Schulz arrived in Philadelphia on September 25, 1732. He also served New Hanover and New Providence. At the latter place the first entries in the parish register date back to 1729, and the congregation numbered about one hundred communicant members when Muhlenberg took charge. In 1732 Pastor Schulz, accompanied by two lay delegates, left for Europe to collect money, and, above all, to secure laborers from Halle, for the mission-work in Pennsylvania. These efforts terminated when Schulz was arrested in Germany for disorderly conduct. Before leaving Pennsylvania, Schulz had ordained John Caspar Stoever, a relative of Pastor J. C. Stoever, Sr., in Spottsylvania, Va., and placed him in charge

of his congregations. Stoever, Jr., had studied theology in Germany, and after his arrival in America, 1728, had been active in mission-work among the Lutherans in Pennsylvania, a labor which he zealously continued till his sudden death in 1779, while confirming a class at Lebanon. Stoever's aversion to Pietism at first kept him from uniting with Muhlenberg. It was 1763, fifteen years after its organization, before he became a member of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. Concerning Stoever and the Agenda of 1748, Muhlenberg relates the following: "We were minded to employ the very words of our Lord Jesus: Take and eat; this is the body of Jesus Christ, etc. Take and drink, this cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ, etc. At the baptism of children it was our intention to ask the sponsors, or godparents: Do you renounce in the name of this child, etc.? To this the opponents [Stoever, Wagner, and their adherents] objected strenuously before we had finished. We therefore made a change immediately and used the words which their terrified consciences desired, *viz.*: This is the *true body*, etc.; this is the *true blood*, etc., and in the formula of baptism: Peter, Paul, or Maria, dost thou renounce, etc.?" Graebner comments as follows: "If the Wagners and Stoevers [whom Muhlenberg severely censured in 1748] had committed no other crimes but that of compelling the 'united preachers' [from Halle] to take a decided Lutheran position, one might wish that their influence had extended still farther." In the following year, 1749, however, the Pennsylvania Synod changed the formula of baptism so that the sponsors were asked, "Do you renounce (believe) in the name of this child, etc.?" (Graebner, 327.)

#### HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG.

**39. Self-sacrificing Halle Emissaries.** — The help which Pastor Schulz and his laymen had requested from Halle in 1734 arrived nine years later. Francke's hesitation with regard to questions of salary, etc., drew the matter out until Muhlenberg declared himself willing to accept the call to America without further conditions. He was the instrument whereby it pleased God to preserve the Lutheran Church in America from complete deterioration and disintegration and from the imminent danger

of apostasy through Zinzendorf. Muhlenberg (Muehlenberg) was born at Eimbeck, Hannover, September 6, 1711. In 1738 he graduated from Goettingen. He spent one year teaching in the Orphan Home at Halle, and served a congregation in Upper Lusatia from 1739 to 1741. In 1741 he also published his only work, a defense of Pietism against B. Mentzer. In the same year he accepted the call to the congregations in Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Providence, and New Hanover. September 23, 1742, he landed at Charleston, visited Bolzius and the Salzburgers in Ebenezer, and arrived in Philadelphia, November 25, 1742. From the very beginning Muhlenberg was successful in his opposition to Zinzendorf, who had come to America in 1741 to convert the Indians and to merge the pious of all churches in the *Unitas Fratrum*. Pretending to be a Lutheran, he had wormed his way into the Lutheran congregation at Philadelphia, assuming the title and functions of Inspector-General of all the Lutheran churches in America. However, unmasked by Muhlenberg, he now, January, 1743, returned to Germany in disgrace. In spite of many other difficulties, Muhlenberg rapidly won recognition from all the congregations. In 1745 he dedicated his first church in Philadelphia. The *Hallesche Nachrichten* contain vivid pictures, from the pens of Muhlenberg and his assistants, of their untiring, self-sacrificing, blessed, and constantly increasing missionary activity, which at the same time served the purpose of encouraging Halle to send additional laborers. The close of January, 1745, saw the arrival of Peter Brunnholtz (who took charge of Philadelphia and Germantown) and of the two catechists Nicholaus Kurtz and J. H. Schaum, who at first served as assistants and were later on ordained as pastors. Muhlenberg wrote to Halle: "To be brief: the church which must be planted here is at a very critical juncture (*Hier ist ecclesia plantanda in einer recht kritischen junctura*). Hence we ought to have experienced and strong men, able to stand in the breach and to dare with patience and self-denial. You, highly venerable fathers, know full well that I am not the man. But I regard my dear colleague Brunnholtz as such a man, and wish that he had two or three colaborgers like himself; that would help us. God would easily direct me to some smaller corner." (290.) In 1743 Muhlenberg sent Tobias Wagner to the Palatines in Tulpe-

hocken Creek, where Gerhard Henkel had already preached, and where, in 1745, Wagner solemnized the marriage of Muhlenberg and the daughter of J. C. Weiser. Services were conducted at this time also in Ohly, Cohenzi, Indianfield, Chester, and Reading (where the Lutherans and the Reformed had erected a church together). In 1745 Muhlenberg conducted a visitation at Raritan, induced Wolff to resign, sent them Kurtz and 1747 Schaum as temporary supply-pastors, and finally, in 1748, induced the congregation to call J. A. Weygand. Following the track of the Moravian Nyberg, who created confusion wherever he went, Muhlenberg secured a foothold also at Lancaster in 1746, at York, and Conewago, in 1747, as well as in Monocacy and Frederick, Md. J. F. Handschuh (Handschuch), who arrived from Halle in 1748, was put in charge of Lancaster. L. H. Schrenck and L. Raus arrived in 1749. The former was stationed in Upper Milford and Saccum, the latter was appointed vicar in Rheinbeck and Camp. F. Schultz and Heintzelmann came in 1751. The latter received an appointment in Philadelphia and married Muhlenberg's daughter. Baugher (Bager) arrived in 1752, and Geroock the year following.—Pastors and congregations were imbued with one and the same spirit, and considered themselves parts of one and the same church, consisting of the "Collegium Pastorum" on the one hand and the "United Congregations" on the other.

**40. Organizing Pennsylvania Synod.**—To establish the congregations, Muhlenberg, with five pastors and ten congregations, on August 26, 1748, organized the Pennsylvania Synod, then generally called "The United Congregations" or "The United Pastors." This event has been designated by Dr. Graebner "the most important in the history of the American Lutheran Church of the eighteenth century." From the very beginning Muhlenberg's three original congregations were called "The United Congregations." This name was extended also to the congregations subsequently organized or served by Muhlenberg and his collaborators at Germantown, Lancaster, Tulpehocken, York, etc. And pastors and congregations being imbued, as they were, with one and the same spirit, and considering themselves parts of one and the same church, consisting of "The College of Pastors (Collegium Pastorum)" on the one hand and

“The United Congregations” on the other, it was but natural that they should unite in a regular synod with regular meetings. The year 1748 was most opportune and suggestive for such an organization. Pastor Hartwick of Rhinebeck had come to Philadelphia. Nicholas Kurtz had arrived in order to be ordained as pastor for the congregation at Tulpéhocken. The dedication of St. Michael’s Church in Philadelphia brought other representative Lutherans to the city. The Swedes were represented by Provost Sandin and Peter Kock (Koch), a trustee of Gloria Dei Church, who zealously advocated synodical connection between the Germans and Swedes. Before the public services, Pastors Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Hartwick met to examine Kurtz. His answers were approved of in Halle as creditable even to candidates in Germany. On the following day, Sunday, St. Michael’s was dedicated. Provost Sandin headed the procession from Brunnholtz’s parsonage to the new church. “Come, Holy Spirit, God and Lord,” was sung. A letter from the Swedish pastor Tranberg, regretting his absence and congratulating the congregation in English, was then read. The address emphasized that “the foundation of this church was laid with the intention that the Evangelical Lutheran doctrine should be taught therein according to the foundation of the prophets and apostles, and according to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other symbolical books.” After singing another hymn, six prayers were offered, two in Swedish by the Swedish pastors, and four in German by Brunnholtz, Hartwick, Handschuh, and Mr. Kock. After another hymn a child was baptized, and a sermon preached by Handschuh. Hereupon the ministers, with a few of the congregation, received the Lord’s Supper. In the afternoon Hartwick preached the ordination sermon. Then, the lay delegates standing in a semicircle about the altar, Provost Sandin and the four German pastors ordained Kurtz. Muhlenberg read the liturgical formula. On Monday, August 26 (15 Old Style), 1748, the first session of Synod was held, N. Kurtz, the newly ordained pastor, delivering the opening sermon.

**41. First Session of Synod.** — According to the minutes, written by Brunnholtz and signed by the four German pastors

residing in Pennsylvania and a number of lay delegates, the synod consisted of six ministers (including Sandin and Hartwick) and twenty-four delegates, exclusive of the church council of the Philadelphia congregation: four lay delegates from Germantown, three from Providence, three from New Hanover, two from Upper Milford, one from Saccum, three from Tulpelhocken, one from Nordkiel, six from Lancaster, and one from Earlington. Peter Kock represented the Swedish laity. The congregation at York, in a letter, regretted the absence of representatives. The organization proceeded without the adoption of any formulated constitution. Though not formally elected, Muhlenberg, by virtue of his first call and commission by the authorities in Halle, was president of the synod. When, at the second meeting of the synod, in 1749, Brunnholtz, on motion of Muhlenberg, was elected overseer of all the United Congregations, this was ignored by the authorities in Halle, and, Brunnholtz's health failing, the office was soon transferred to Muhlenberg, who exercised it for many years. At the first meeting, after the hymn, "Du suesse Lieb', schenk' uns deine Gunst," was sung, Muhlenberg addressed the assembly, saying, in part: This union was desired for a long time. The effort made five years ago in the Swedish church was frustrated by Nyberg. Unity among us is necessary. Every member in the congregation has children. In their interest elders are required to assist in making a good church order. For this purpose we are here assembled, and, God willing, shall meet annually. "We preachers, here present," Muhlenberg emphasized, "have not run of ourselves, but have been called here and urged to go. We are bound to render account to God and to our consciences. We maintain connection with our fathers in Europe. We must not only care for ourselves, but also for our descendants." In part, Muhlenberg's remarks reflected on Stoever, Streit (Streiter, as he is called in the minutes), Andreae, and Wagner. These ministers had not been invited to participate in the organization of the synod, because, as a declaration put on record by synod explains, "1. they, without reason, decry us [Muhlenberg and his adherents] as Pietists; 2. are not sent and have neither an internal nor an external call; 3. are unwilling to observe a uniform order of service with us, each following the ceremonies of his country;

4. an experience of six years had taught Muhlenberg that their object was nothing but bread; 5. they were subject to no consistory and gave no account of the exercise of their office." The lay delegates were called upon to give a report concerning the efficiency of their pastors, and their opinion concerning the new liturgy, which they regarded as too long. Also the condition of the parochial schools was inquired into. The conference with the laymen was adjourned Monday afternoon, after which they dined together. The pastors then attended to business generally regarded as belonging to them. Hartwick addressed the elders, wishing their congregations every blessing. The Swedish provost expressed his desire to be a member of the body. But Peter Kock having died, no Swede attended the meeting in the following year. Seven annual meetings were held by the United Congregations, the last at New Hanover in 1754. Revived by Dr. Wrangel and Muhlenberg in 1760, this oldest Lutheran synod in America exists to the present day as "The Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania." (Graebner, 301 ff.)

#### FURTHER ACTIVITY AND DEATH OF MUHLENBERG.

42. **Discouraging Conditions.** — The joyous events of 1748 in Philadelphia were followed by disappointments to such an extent that after 1754 the synodical meetings were abandoned till 1760, when, as stated, Provost Von Wrangel revived the synod in the interest of establishing a German-Swedish organization. The failure was caused by various discouragements: the deaths of Heintzelman and Brunnholtz; the troubles in the congregations of Handschuh at Lancaster, Germantown, and Philadelphia; the opposition of Stoever and other anti-Pietists, whom the synod in 1748 marked as undesirables; charges against Muhlenberg and his collaborators, that they were but secret agents of Zinzendorf, etc.; and above all the entirely insufficient support in men and moneys from Halle. The difficulties and discouraging conditions under which Muhlenberg and his assistants were laboring, appear from the urgent appeal, signed by Muhlenberg, Brunnholtz, and Handschuh, adopted by the synod in 1754, and sent to both London and Halle. Dr. Jacobs writes: "It is one of the most important papers in the Halle 'Reports.' The entire field is surveyed, the

history of German immigration traced, and the religious condition of the immigrants described. The manner in which other denominations and the Swedish Lutherans are aided by foreign help is shown, and a very discouraging contrast is drawn. The condition of each parish is then candidly and at length set forth. Three great dangers they see threatening the inner life of congregations, *viz.*: the assumption, by the leading men of particular parishes, of the right to dictate, as a compensation for the perhaps greater amount expected of them for the pastor's support; the lawlessness of immigrants who abuse the freedom of the country, want to break through all rules, and revile all good order, the regular ministry, and divine service as papacy itself; the introduction of worthless men into the country as pretended ministers by the Newlanders, who sell their services from the ship to Lutherans willing to be deceived in this way. The United Pastors, they urge, are almost powerless to resist. The people are, as a rule, poor. In a congregation of three hundred members scarcely fifteen can be found able to contribute toward the building of churches; and the responsibility for debts incurred must, therefore, as a rule, fall upon the pastors themselves. Many thousands of Lutheran people are scattered throughout North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, etc. No provision is made for the traveling expenses of the pastors or supplies for their places, if these Lutherans are cared for. People come often one and even two hundred miles to hear a sermon and receive the Sacrament, and weep bitterly over the destitution, which no one endeavors to remove. They [the signers of the appeal] contrast the condition of a pastor in the New with that of one in the Old World. The latter has the assurance of necessary support, of protection in his office, of all needed buildings, of provision for the proper instruction of his people. The former has none of these. Among ten families there is scarcely one or two that contribute according to their promises. The sects diffuse among the people the ideas, to which they lend too ready assent, that the pastors as well as their hearers ought to work at a trade, cut wood, sow and reap during the week, and then preach to them gratuitously on Sunday. They hear such things wherever they go—

in papers, in company, on their journeys, and at the taverns. The picture is a very dark one. The pastors feel that they do not see how it is possible for them to advance; and yet to recede or even to be stationary must be fatal." Jacobs continues: "Such representations probably had something to do with the impression current for a while at Halle that Muhlenberg was visionary and eccentric, so strange do his statements seem to those incompetent from personal observation to appreciate the urgency of the situation in Pennsylvania. If there was any time when, even for a moment, Muhlenberg entertained the suggestion of transferring the care of the Lutherans of Pennsylvania to the Church of England, it was only at some such time when he and his associates in the synod were allowed to struggle on under such burdens almost unaided, while union with the Church of England would at once have provided all missionaries sent thither with an appropriation almost sufficient for support, and with far better protection against the prevalent disorder. If the Lutherans in Europe could not meet the demands of the hour, we can pardon the thought, which never became a fixed purpose, that, sooner than have the thousands for whose care he felt himself responsible neglected, some other mode of relief would have to be sought." (246 ff.)

**43. Further Activity and Death.**—In May, 1751, as related above, Muhlenberg became pastor of the Dutch congregation in New York. From 1753 to 1761 he once more labored in New Hanover and Providence. During this period he made visits to Raritan (1757, 1758 for nine weeks, 1759 with his family, again in October, 1759, and in January, 1760), his assistant J. H. Schaum in the mean time representing him in Providence. October 29, 1761 Muhlenberg returned to Philadelphia to allay the strife which had broken out. Here he lived in his own home, and maintained an intimate intercourse with Dr. Wrangel. By the new congregational constitution, which his congregation subscribed to in 1762, and which, in the course of time, was adopted by nearly all the congregations in Pennsylvania, Muhlenberg's influence was extended far and wide. In 1769 he dedicated the new Zion Church at Philadelphia. (The national memorial services of Benjamin Franklin [1790], of Washington [1799], and of Abraham Lincoln

[1865] were held in this church.) September 8, 1774, he arrived in Charleston, accompanied by his wife and daughter, where the congregation had requested him to settle their quarrel, which he did with skill and success. His real goal, however, was Ebenezer, where he, by order of the authorities in Europe, was to conduct a visitation and to repair the harm done by Triebner. Here he drafted a new constitution, which was adopted by the Salzburgers and resulted in a temporary peace. On February 6, 1775, he began his journey back to Pennsylvania. When the vestry of his congregation at Philadelphia in 1779, without further ado, elected Kunze to be his successor, Muhlenberg conducted himself with dignity. The congregation rescinded her action, whereupon Muhlenberg resigned, and was given a pension of £100 annually and granted permission to preach occasionally in the church. As early as 1748 Muhlenberg had compiled an Agenda, which at first was circulated in manuscript, and was printed in 1786 in a somewhat modified form. The only objection which, in 1748, the congregations raised to the Agenda was that "public worship would last too long, especially in the cold winter months"; wherefore "they requested that it be abbreviated." In 1782 Muhlenberg also did the chief work in preparing the hymnal, which was printed in 1784. In the same year Pennsylvania Academy conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Muhlenberg accepted the title, but requested his friends not to make any use of it in their intercourse with him. Muhlenberg died October 7, 1787. Taking leave of his friend for this life, he spoke of the journey ahead to his true fatherland, repeating the words of the hymn: "Ich hab' vor mir ein' schwere Reis' Zu dir in's Himmels Paradeis, Das ist mein rechtes Vaterland, Darauf du hast dein Blut gewandt." Shortly before his death he prayed the stanza: "Mach' End', o Herr, mach' Ende An aller unsrer Not, Staerk' unsre Fuess' und Haende Und lass bis in den Tod Uns allzeit deiner Pflege Und Treu' empfohlen sein, So gehen unsre Wege Gewiss zum Himmel ein." Muhlenberg's funeral was attended by eight Lutheran pastors, the Reformed minister Schlatter, and a great concourse of people, so that Pastor J. L. Voigt was compelled to deliver his oration in the open. Memorial services were conducted in New York and in many other places, as well as in almost all congrega-

tions belonging to the synod. In Muhlenberg the greatest man whom God had given to the Lutheran Church of America in the eighteenth century, "the patriarch of the American Lutheran Church," had passed away. His body was interred just outside the walls of the church in Trappe. A marble slab over his grave bears the inscription: "Qualis et quantus fuerit, Non ignorabunt sine lapide Futura Saecula. (Future ages will know his character and importance without a stone.)" (484. 521.)

**44. Tributes to, and Estimates of, Muhlenberg.** — In his letter to Dr. Freylinghausen in Halle, Muhlenberg himself reveals the pious and humble frame of his mind as follows: "To-day, December 6, 1762, it is forty years since I set foot in Philadelphia for the first time; and I believe that my end is no longer removed very far. Had I during these forty years served my Lord as faithfully as Jeremiah, I could look forward to a more joyful end. But I must now account it grace and mercy unparalleled if the gracious Redeemer, for the sake of His all-sufficient merits, will not regard my mistakes and weaknesses, but receive me graciously." Speaking of Muhlenberg's faithfulness, Dr. E. A. W. Krauss remarks: "Muhlenberg continued faithful in things both small and great, even after he had received assistance from Germany, and one coworker after another began to labor at his side. Before long his activity had exceeded the sphere of his three congregations. On request he visited the scattered Lutherans in Germantown, Tulpehocken, Lancaster, York, Raritan, Frederick. He was the counselor of poorly served congregations, the judge in their quarrels. Confidence was everywhere reposed in him. By reason of his talent for organizing, his erudition, but, above all, his unselfishness, his modesty, dignity, and piety, he was in universal demand, and was compelled to take the lead, which he also kept till his blessed departure from this world." (*Lebensbilder*, 694.) Dr. H. E. Jacobs sketches Muhlenberg's character as follows: "Depth of religious conviction, extraordinary inwardness of character, apostolic zeal for the spiritual welfare of individuals, absorbing devotion to his calling and all its details, were among his most marked characteristics. These were combined with an intuitive penetration and ex-

tended width of view, a statesmanlike grasp of every situation in which he was placed, an almost prophetic foresight, coolness, and discrimination of judgment, and peculiar gifts for organization and administration." Dr. A. Graebner writes: "The task which Muhlenberg found set before him when he entered upon the wild and disordered field which had been allotted to him here, was such that, if any one in Halle had been able to tell him and had told him what was awaiting him in America, he would hardly have found the necessary courage and cheerfulness to lay his hand to the plow which was to convert this wild bramblepatch into an arable field. Still, where could a second man have been found at that time who would have proven equal to the task in the same measure as Henry Melchior Muhlenberg? Richly endowed with a robust physique and a pious mind, with faithfulness in matters great and small, with cheerful, but firm courage, with restless activity and a spirit of progressive enterprise, with wisdom and prudence, with the ability to inform himself quickly and to accommodate himself to the circumstances, and, in addition to this, with the necessary independence of volition and action,—characteristics seldom found combined in one and the same person,—Muhlenberg was splendidly equipped, both as to degree and variety, with the gifts which a missionary and an organizer has need of. And from the very first day of his planting and watering God gave a rich increase to his labors, so rich, that Muhlenberg could say with a grateful heart: 'It seems as though now the time had come that God would visit us with special grace here in Pennsylvania.' Furthermore, self-exaltation was utterly foreign to him. 'God does not need me,' he would say; 'He can carry out His work also without me.' Likewise, he was ever content although he never saw much money. During the first half-year of his stay in Philadelphia he earned his board by giving music lessons." (279.)

*Dr. A. Spaeth:* "Though there were Lutheran congregations and pastors among the Dutch on the Hudson, and among the Swedes on the Delaware, as early as the first half of the seventeenth century, and, later on, among the numerous German immigrants, still the real organization of the Lutheran Church in America, on the foundation of the fathers, only dates from the middle of the eighteenth century, and is due to the

Rev. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, by common consent the patriarch of the Lutheran Church on this continent, through whose efforts the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 'The Mother Synod,' was established in 1748. In missionary zeal, in pastoral tact and fidelity, in organizing ability and personal piety, he had no superior." (*C. P. Krauth*, 1, 316.)

### MUHLENBERG'S CONFESSIONALISM.

**45. Unqualified Subscription to Entire Book of Concord.** — Like the "Fathers in Halle," Muhlenberg, self-evidently, desired to be a Lutheran and to build a Lutheran Church in America. He himself says, in a manner somewhat touchy: "I defy Satan and every lying spirit to lay at my door anything which contradicts the teaching of our apostles or the Symbolical Books. I have often said and written that I have found neither error, nor mistake, nor any defect in our Evangelical doctrine, based, as it is, on the apostles and prophets, and exhibited in our Symbolical Books." *Dr. Spaeth*: "The standards of the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century were accepted and endorsed by Muhlenberg without reservation, and in his whole ministerial work he endeavored to come up to this standard, as he had solemnly pledged himself in his ordination vow before the theological faculty of the university at Leipzig, on August 24, 1739, which committed to him the office of 'teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments according to the rule given in the writings of the prophets and apostles, the sum of which is contained in those three symbols, the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian, in the Augsburg Confession laid before Emperor Charles V, A. D. 1530, in the Apology of the same, in Dr. Luther's Large and Small Catechism, in the Articles subscribed to in the Smalcald Convention, and in the Formula of Concord. He solemnly promised that he would propose to his hearers what would be conformed and consentient to these writings, and that he would never depart from the sense which they give.' (*Dr. W. J. Mann's The Conservatism of Henry Melchior Muehlenberg*, in the *Lutheran Church Review*, January, 1888.) And this was the position not of the patriarch alone, but of his collaborators, of the whole Synod of Pennsylvania, which he organized, and of the sister-

or daughter-synod of New York, during the lifetime of Muhlenberg and Kunze. 'Those fathers were very far from giving the Lutheran Church, as they organized it on this new field of labor, a form and character in any essential point different from what the Lutheran Church was in the Old World, and especially in Germany. They retained not only the old doctrinal standards, but also the old traditional elements and forms of worship; the church-year with its great festivals, its Gospel- and Epistle-lessons, the Liturgy, the rite of Confirmation, preparatory service for the Lord's Supper, connected with the confession of sins and absolution. Their doctrinal position was unmistakably Lutheran, in the sense in which Lutheranism is historically known, and is something individual and distinct, and as such stands in opposition to Romanism on the one hand, and to Zwingli, Calvin, and all other so-called Protestant parties on the other. Those fathers were admitted to the ministry on condition of their own declaration that they were in harmony with the Confessio Augustana Invariata, and with all the other Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. They demanded of those whom they admitted to the sacred office the same condition. They allowed no organization or constitutions of congregations without demanding the acknowledgment of all the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church as the doctrinal basis.' (1, 317.) In a letter dated June 14, 1774, and addressed to one of the members of the Lutheran congregation at Charleston, S. C., some of whose troubles and difficulties he had endeavored to adjust, Muhlenberg stated the rule of his own personal course as follows: "During the thirty-two years of my sojourning in America, time and again occasions were given me to join the Episcopal Church, and to receive four or five times more salary than my poor German fellow-members of the Lutheran faith gave me; but I preferred reproach in and with my people to the treasures in Egypt." (Jacobs, 298.) The confirmation form of the Agenda contained the question: "Do you intend to remain true to the truth of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as you have learned to know it and solemnly confessed it?" (G., 498.)

**46. Pledge of Pastors and Congregations.** — In like manner as Muhlenberg himself, all his colaborgers and congre-

gations were pledged to the Lutheran confessions. The religious oath which Brunnholtz took reads, in part, as follows: "I, Peter Brunnholtz, do solemnly swear and before God Almighty do take an oath upon my soul . . . that I will abide by the pure and unadulterated Word of God, as, according to the sense of the Spirit, it has been diligently compiled from Holy Scripture against all errorists in the three chief Symbols, and especially also in the true Lutheran church-books, as the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, its Apology, the Smaleald Articles, the two Catechisms of Luther, and in the specific Formula of Concord, and that I will teach according to them."

(G., 283.) In similar fashion, Kurtz, Weygand, and all pastors solemnly promised to discharge their office "according to the pure doctrine of the apostles and prophets and all our Synodical Books." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 1856, 120.) According to the Agenda of 1748 the catechumens promised faithfulness unto death "to the truth of the Evangelical Lutheran Church which they had solemnly confessed." (488.) From the very outset, Muhlenberg also had the congregations subscribe to articles in which they confessed themselves to God's Word and the Lutheran Symbols. (299.) The congregations, in agreement with the constitution of 1762, pledged their pastors to preach "the Word of God according to the foundation of the apostles and prophets and in conformity with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession." True, the Pennsylvania Synod, at its organization in 1748, did not draw up any special articles of confession, yet, according to the Agenda which had been previously adopted, it was regarded as self-evident that all pastors and congregations subscribe to the Lutheran Symbols. The synodical constitution of 1778, which was entered in the official book of record begun in 1781, contained the following provisions: "As to his life and teaching, every pastor is to be found in consonance with the Word of God and our Symbolical Books." "In case complaints are lodged against teachers, the investigation must concern itself with: 1. express errors against the clear sense of Holy Writ and our Symbolical Books of faith." (529.) Muhlenberg's devotion to the Lutheran doctrine appears also from the interest and zeal which he showed in furthering the institution of catechetical instruction and in establishing parochial schools. One of the chief questions to engage the

attention of the first convention of Synod in 1748 was, "What is the condition of the schools?" Yet, though Muhlenberg, in the manner described, stood for confessional Lutheranism, it cannot be maintained convincingly that his influence in this direction was sound and salubrious in every respect. His was not the genuine Lutheranism of Luther, but the modified Lutheranism, then advocated in Europe and Germany generally, notably in Halle and the circles of the Pietists, a Lutheranism inoculated with legalism, subjectivism, indifferentism, and unionism. Muhlenberg's confessionalism was of the historic kind, that is to say, reverence for the venerable Lutheran symbols rather than the living power of Lutheran truth itself, directing, permeating, and shaping one's entire ecclesiastical activity both as to teaching and practise.

#### MUHLENBERG'S PIETISM.

**47. Subjectivism of Halle Pietists.** — Following are some of the aberrations of the Pietists in Halle: That doctrine was of minor importance for, and as compared with, piety; that sanctification was not contained in, but must be added to, faith; that repentance and conversion were urged in such a manner as if man himself could force them; that such Christians as could not tell of certain peculiar penitential struggles and sensations of grace were regarded as unconverted; that the assurance of salvation was not based on the objective Word of God, but on subjective marks, notably such as were found in those converted in the circles of the Pietists; that the afflicted, instead of being comforted with the Gospel of the unconditional pardon of the entire world, were bidden to feel the pulse of their own piety; that such as did not manifest the symptoms of conversion *à la Halle*, were judged uncharitably and looked down upon as not being truly converted; that the "revived" and "awakened" were regarded as the real church in the Church, the *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*. And what of the pietism of the Halle emissaries in Pennsylvania? Dr. Mann declared concerning Muhlenberg and his co-laborers: "Their pietism was truly Lutheran piety, a warm-hearted, devout, practical Lutheranism." (Spaeth, 1, 318.) However, traces of the morbid and infected Lutheranism cul-

tivated by Pietists, were but too apparent also in Muhlenberg and the associates carefully selected for him by Francke and Freylinghausen in Halle. The piety for which they strove so earnestly and zealously was, in more than one respect, neither truly evangelical nor soundly Lutheran, but of a legalistic and subjective nature. They delighted in evangelistic sermons designed to convert men in the manner of Halle. They endeavored to ascertain who were the truly converted in their congregations. As a standard they applied their own experiences and as models the Halle converts. Instead of immediately comforting terrified sinners with the full consolation of the Gospel, they proved them "according to the marks of the state of grace." *Graebner*: "While Diaconus in Grosshennersdorf, Muhlenberg had already published a polemical tract against Dr. Balthasar Mentzer, who had attacked Pietism, and had pictured the time before the rise of Pietism as a time of darkness, in which God had 'set up a true light here and there, until at last the faithful servants of the Lord, the sainted Spener, Francke, Breithaupt, Anton, and others arose' and 'again brought forth the Bible.' At that time Muhlenberg advocated private meetings for souls who had been 'awakened from the sleep of sin,' to which the Burgomaster of Eimbeck referred when he sent word to Muhlenberg 'to cease the pietistic conventicles, as they were against the law of the land.'" (315.)

**48. Converts, Prayer-Meetings, Revivals.**—Brunnholtz, whose work was highly praised by Muhlenberg, says of his parishioners, whom, nevertheless, he admitted to the Lord's Table, that, for the greater part, they were "totally blind and dead," people who had not yet experienced any "true change of heart"; that in present-day congregations one must "be content with the gleanings while looking and waiting for traces of divine activity, where, when, in whom, and whether the Spirit can give a rich harvest." It is only too true, he continues, "that the great multitude, both old and young, are still buried in carnal-mindedness and in great ignorance, and stand in need of a true conversion." "There are indeed a few, some also in my two congregations, concerning whom I have the well-founded hope that they have been awakened from the spiritual sleep of sin and are being drawn to the Son by the

Father." "With regard to my congregation here in Philadelphia, I am not able to boast very much of the majority and of the outwardly great number, since there is still much corruption among them. The Lord, however, has granted me a small remnant, who have been awakened by the Word, and who earnestly seek after the paths of peace, permitting themselves quietly, but in earnestness, to be prepared for the rest of God." Muhlenberg says: "True repentance and conversion according to the Word of God is a difficult matter and a rare occurrence." "We continued our labors upon the inner and outward upbuilding of the Church, because a small, divinely sanctified seed was noticed among them." What Brunnholtz and Muhlenberg looked for in the communicant members of their congregations whom they regarded as unconverted were, no doubt, the Halle symptoms. In 1748 submissiveness to be guided by the pastor was numbered among these marks. When the elders of the congregation in Lancaster opposed their pastor and insisted upon their opinion, which was not wrong by any means, they were admonished "to convert themselves with all their hearts, since otherwise they could not properly wait on their office, and the pastor's trials in the congregation would become too great." (319.) The "small remnant of the converted" were nurtured by the pastors in "special prayer-meetings in the houses." (320.) This was the practise of Brunnholtz in Philadelphia. And Muhlenberg wrote from New York in 1751: "I have learned that among the Reformed here there is a small body of awakened souls who hunger and thirst after righteousness. It is said that this awakening was brought about by the younger of the two Reformed pastors. My hostess also belongs to the Reformed congregation. Some years ago she was so terrified by the opinion of the unconditional decree of God that a hysterical malady set in with which she is still somewhat afflicted. I searched for the marks of the state of grace. She answered sensibly, which gave me hope that she is in a state of grace. My host desired me to go into a private chamber with him and his weak spouse, and to pray in secret, which we did." "At the close of the day my dear host again desired that I pray with him and his wife in private, since she thereby had experienced strength and relief on the former occasion. On the 30th of July I was taken to the pious Eng-

lish merchant, who had some awakened souls with him. They sang a psalm, read a chapter from a devotional book, and urged me to pray at the close. After a time the dear souls returned to their homes, and I remained with him till eleven o'clock and employed the time in pleasant and edifying conversation with him and his godly wife." "August 1, Saturday evening, I preached penitential sermons both in the German and Dutch languages. . . . The church was well filled on this occasion, and the parting seemed to touch and sadden the awakened and well-meaning souls." Weygand continued the work in the spirit of Muhlenberg, conducting "private hours" with the "awakened souls," and finding particular delight in some souls who had been awakened by Wesley. When Whitefield returned to Pennsylvania in 1762, Dr. Wrangel entered into relations with him and began to conduct prayer-meetings in a private house in the city, and when the room in that house could no longer contain the people, Muhlenberg's congregation granted him the use of their church. When not prevented by other duties, Muhlenberg regularly attended these English devotional hours. The congregational constitution of 1762 especially reserved for the pastor the right to "conduct hours of edification, exhortation, and prayer in churches and schools, on week-days or evenings, as necessity might dictate, and as strength and circumstances might permit." (383. 425. 440. 485.) Dr. J. H. C. Helmuth was the first to report on a revivalistic awakening in his congregation at Lancaster, in 1773. Later on, 1811, Helmuth, in the name of the Pennsylvania Synod, wrote a letter to Paul Henkel, then on his missionary tours in Ohio, warning him not to participate in camp-meetings, "if he should come into contact with similar aberrations from our Lutheran ways." But even at this time Synod did not take a decided stand against revivalistic enthusiasm. Already in the first decades of the nineteenth century reports, coming out of the Synod, such as the following were heard: "Here the fire is also burning." "Here we behold miracles of God's grace; everywhere we find the wounded, the weeping, the moaning, and those who are praying. Some cried out, 'My God, what shall I do that I may be saved?' Others asked with tears, 'Can I still be saved?'" (549.) In 1810 the North Carolina Synod resolved to have Philip Henkel try out a revival, since

such awakenings were also to be desired among Lutherans. During the revival agitation from 1830 to 1850, the English Lutheran churches caught the contagion in great numbers. They introduced emotional preaching, the mourners' bench, protracted meetings, and, vying with the fanatical sects, denounced as spiritually dead formalists all who adhered to the old ways of Lutheranism. In its issue of March 21, 1862, the *Lutheran Observer* declared that the "Symbolism" of the Old Lutherans in St. Louis meant the death of the Lutheran Church, which nothing but revivals were able to save. (*L. u. W.* 1862, 152; 1917, 374.) Muhlenberg's Pietism had helped to prepare the way for this Methodistic aberration.

### MUHLENBERG'S HIERARCHICAL TENDENCIES.

**49. Government of and by the Ministers.** — A clear conception of the doctrines of the Church and of the holy ministry was something Muhlenberg did not possess. Hence his congregations also were not educated to true independence and to the proper knowledge and exercise of their priestly rights and duties. Dr. Mann says of Muhlenberg and his coworkers: "These fathers were very far from giving the Lutheran Church, as they organized it on this new field of labor, a form and character in any essential point different from what the Lutheran Church was in the Old World, and especially in Germany." (Spaeth, *C. P. Krauth*, 1, 317.) The pastor ruled the elders; the pastor and the elders ruled the congregation; the synod ruled the pastor, the elders, and the congregation; the College of Pastors ruled the synod and the local pastor together with his elders and his congregation; and all of these were subject to, and ruled by, the authorities in Europe. The local congregations were taught to view themselves, not as independent, but as parts of, and subject to, the body of United Congregations and Pastors. The constitution for congregations simply presupposed that a congregation was a member of, and subordinate to, Synod. (499.) This appears also from a document signed by the elders of Tulpelocken and Northkill (Nordkiel), August 24, 1748, two days before the organization of the Pennsylvania Synod. In it the elders, in the name of the congregations, state and promise: "In this it always re-

mains presupposed that we with the United Congregations constitute one whole Ev. Lutheran congregation, which acknowledges and respects as her lawful pastors all the pastors who constitute the College of Pastors (Collegium Pastorum) and remains in the closest connection with them, as being our regular teachers. . . . Accordingly, we have the desire to be embodied and incorporated in the United Congregations in Pennsylvania, and to be recognized and received by them as brethren and members of a special congregation of the Ev. Lutheran Church, and consequently to share in the pastoral care of the College of all the Rev. Pastors of the United Congregations. In accordance herewith we most publicly and solemnly desire, acknowledge and declare all the Rev. Pastors of the United Church-Congregations to be our pastors and ministers (Seelsorger und Hirten); we also give them complete authority to provide for the welfare of our souls, how and through whom, also as long as, they choose. We furthermore promise to regard the Rev. College of Pastors of the Ev. Lutheran Congregations in Pennsylvania as a lawful and regular presbyterium and ministerium and particularly as our pastors- and ministers-in-chief, also to respect and regard them as such, without whose previously known advice and consent we do, order, resolve, or change nothing; hence to have nothing to do with any [other] pastor, nor even, without their previously known advice and consent, to undertake anything in important church-matters with the pastor whom they have sent to us; on the contrary, to approve of and with all our powers to observe and execute whatever, in church-matters of our own and the congregations, the whole Rev. College of Pastors will resolve, and properly indicate and make known to us. Furthermore we promise to recognize, receive, respect, honor and hear the teacher [minister] as our lawful and divinely called teacher as long as the Rev. College of Pastors will see fit to leave him with us; nor to make any opposition in case they should be pleased for important reasons to call him away and to put another in his place; moreover, to receive and regard his successor with equal love and duty. We furthermore promise, if (which God forfend) a misunderstanding or separation should arise between the whole congregation or part of it and the teacher, or between members of the congregation, to report this

immediately to the Rev. College of Pastors, and to await their decision, and to abide by it." (301 f.) *Graebner*: "One's indignation is roused when reading how the elders of the Lancaster congregation were treated at the first synod. These men defended the by no means improper demand of their congregation that such as had fallen away to the sects and again returned should subscribe to the constitution of the congregation before they once more were recognized as members. In spite of the opinion of the assembly and the utterly wrong admonition 'to leave it to their pastor,' the elders 'adhered to their opinion.' Immediately their conversion is questioned, and 'all the elders who have not yet been thoroughly converted are admonished to convert themselves with all their heart.' The remark of the minutes, 'They kept silence,' conveys the impression that the rebuke had been merited, and that the cut was felt." (320.) According to the constitution for congregations, subscribed to October 18, 1762, by Muhlenberg and Handschuh and 270 members of their congregations, the grades of admonition and church discipline were: 1. admonition by the preacher alone; 2. admonition by the preacher in the presence of the elders and wardens; 3. expulsion before or by the whole church council. (492.) The same constitution contains the provision: If any deacon or elder who has been elected to perform this arduous duty refuses to accept the office without sufficient reasons, "he is not to be excused until he has made a considerable contribution to the church treasury." (490.) At synod the pastors ruled supreme. The lay delegates, consisting of the elders of the congregations, merely reported to Synod, when asked, concerning the work, fidelity, and efficiency of their pastors, the parochial schools, etc., and presented requests to Synod. But they had no voice in her decisions. In the common assembly of the pastors and laymen no vote was taken. The *Lutheran Cyclopedia* says: "The deliberations were exclusively those of the pastors, while the lay delegates were present only to furnish the needed information concerning local conditions and the fidelity of pastors." (493.) Furthermore, the ministerium, the college of pastors, conferred the office and made pastors through ordination, a rite considered essential to the ministry, and without which no one was regarded a lawful and full-

fledged pastor. Thus, for instance, in the case of J. A. Weygand it was held that he was given the right to perform all the functions pertaining to his office, not by the call of the congregation which he had accepted, but by his subsequent ordination. (432.)

**50. Obedience to Ministerium and Fathers in Halle.** — In the ordination the pastors were pledged to obey the Ministerium. In Weygand's call the clause was embodied, "that he would submit to the investigation and judgment of the United Pastors and the Venerable Fathers" in Halle. (452.) The manner in which Kurtz was bound appears from the following points of the "Revers" which he had to sign before his ordination in 1748: "2. To consider my congregation nothing but a part of the United Congregations. . . . 4. To introduce no ceremonies into the public worship or into the administration of the Sacraments other than those which have been introduced by the College of Pastors of the United Congregations, also to use no other book of forms than the one which will be assigned to me by them. 5. To undertake nothing of importance alone nor with the assistance of the church-council, except it have been previously communicated to the Reverend College of Pastors, and their opinion have been obtained, as well as to abide by their good counsel and advice. 6. To render a verbal or written account of my pastorate at the demand of the Reverend College of Pastors. 7. To keep a diary and day-book and to record therein official acts and remarkable occurrences. 8. Should they call me hence, to accept the call, and not to resist." (305.) Before his ordination Pastor J. H. Schaum had to sign a "Revers" and, with a handclasp, seal the promise to the United Pastors that he as their adjunct "would be faithful and obedient to them." To the congregations the Ministerium did not only prescribe the liturgy, but appointed and removed their pastors as they saw fit. Pastor Schaum's call to New York was signed by the four pastors, Muhlenberg, Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Kurtz as their own vocation, in their own name, not in the name of the congregation. (327.) The congregation at Lancaster desired Kurtz as their pastor instead of Handschuh, whom the Ministerium was planning to send to them. Muhlenberg, however, reports: "We bade them consider this and demanded a short answer,

giving them to understand that, if a single one of them would be restive and dissatisfied with our advice and arrangement, we would consent to give them neither the one nor the other, but would turn to the other congregations still vacant and leave the dust to them. They must consider it a special favor that we had come to them first." Graebner comments on this as follows: "One can safely say that there could be found to-day in all America not a single Lutheran pastor or congregation who would consent to concede to a synod such powers as Pastor Kurtz and the congregation at Tulpehocken yielded to the 'United Pastors' in 1748." (321.) The superiors of the United Pastors and their congregations were the "Fathers in Europe." They had commissioned them, and to them they were responsible. All decisions of Synod in doctrinal, liturgical, and governmental questions were subject to the advice and approval of the authorities in Halle. When the church council of the congregation in Philadelphia sent a humble petition to the Synod in 1750, requesting permission to retain the services of Pastor Brunnholtz for themselves, they received the answer: We have no right to make changes without the previous knowledge and permission of the "Fathers in Europe." (330.) In order to ordain Weygand, Muhlenberg had to get permission from the "Fathers in Europe." (432.) Even such pastors as Stoever and Wagner, who did not unite with the Ministerium, were by Muhlenberg designated as "such as had run of themselves," as "so-called pastors," who had "neither an inner nor an outward call," and "who were concerned about nothing but their daily bread." And why? Because, according to Muhlenberg, they had not "been sent" (by the Ministerium or the Fathers); because they were not subject to a consistory, did not render account of their pastorates, and would not observe the same order with those who had come from Halle. (311.) Concerning Weygand, who arrived in 1748, Muhlenberg reports: "I asked him what he was now going to do in Pennsylvania, whether he intended to be for us or against us; if he desired to be with us, it would be necessary for us first to obtain permission from our Venerable Fathers. If, however, he intended to be against us, he might come on, we entertained no fear, as we had already encountered

such as had run of themselves. He answered, 'God forfend!' He would not side with the Ministerium, to which men belonged like Valentine Kraft, Andrew Stoever, Wagner, and the like, though they had requested him to join them; that, on the other hand, he would not be in our way either, but rather go elsewhere and begin a school at some place or another." (431. 322.)

**51. Constitution of 1792.**—The new constitution, adopted by the Pennsylvania Synod in 1792, though granting a modified suffrage to lay delegates in all important questions, left the synod what it had been, a body governed by the clergy. Dr. Graebner says: "It has been pointed out how this [hierarchical] trait plainly appeared already when the Pennsylvania Synod was founded; later on we meet it everywhere and in all synods organized prior to the General Synod. According to the conception generally prevailing a synod had its real foundation, its essential part, not in the congregations, but in the preachers. This idea governed their thinking and speaking. The 'preachers of the State of Ohio united with some of the preachers in Pennsylvania living nearest to them, and established a conference or synod of their own.' Some 'preachers west of the Susquehanna' were granted their petition of being permitted to form a synod. In agreement herewith they preferred to speak of a synod according to its chief and fundamental part, as a 'ministerium.' The constitution of the Pennsylvania Synod began: 'We Evangelical Lutheran preachers in Pennsylvania and the neighboring States, by our signatures to this constitution, acknowledging ourselves as a body, name this union of ours The German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium in Pennsylvania and the neighboring States, and our individual meetings A Ministerial Assembly.' Lay delegates of the congregations, though admitted to the synodical conventions in Pennsylvania and at other places, were nowhere recognized as members having equal rights with the ministers. It was as late as 1792 that the lay delegates obtained the right to vote in Pennsylvania, and even then only with restrictions. In the affairs of greatest import (doctrinal matters, admission of new members, etc.) they were privileged neither to speak nor to vote. On this point the ministerial order of the Pennsylvania Synod declared: 'Lay delegates who

have a right to vote shall sit together at one place in the assembly; they are privileged to offer motions, and to give their opinion and cast their votes in all questions submitted for decision and determination, except in matters pertaining to the learning of a candidate or a catechist, to questions of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, the admission to, and expulsion from, the ministerium, and other, similar cases, for the ministerial assembly has cognizance of such as these.' The constitution of the New York Ministerium contained the same provision, chap. 7, § 4: 'Each lay delegate shall have a right to take part in the debates of the House, to offer resolutions, and to vote on all questions, except the examining, licensing, or ordaining of candidates for the ministry, the admission of ministers into the association or their exclusion from it, and the discussion of weighty articles of faith or cases of conscience.' The right of a layman to vote was regarded as grounded in that of the minister, not the right of both in the congregation. When a minister lost his vote, the delegate of the congregation lost his too." The constitution of the Pennsylvania Synod provided: Such lay delegates only "as have an ordained preacher or licensed candidate, and whose teacher is himself present," shall have a right to vote. Accordingly, "no more lay delegates can cast their votes than the number of ordained preachers and licensed candidates present." Furthermore, the resolutions of Synod were regarded as binding on the congregations. The constitution of the Pennsylvania Ministerium provided, chap. 6, § 14: "Whereas the United Congregations are represented in the synodical assembly by their delegates and have a seat and vote in it, they accordingly are bound willingly to observe the decisions and resolutions of the synodical assembly and of the ministerium." Chap. 7, § 5 of the constitution of the New York Ministerium read: "Every congregation which is represented by a delegate in the synods of this body is bound to receive, and submit to, the resolutions and recommendations of the ministerium, and to bear its part of all expenses and services necessary for the welfare of the associated churches generally and the advancement of the common cause. And if any congregation perseveres in refusing such submission, it shall no longer be entitled to a representation in this body." (693 ff.)

## MUHLENBERG'S UNIONISM.

**52. Attitude toward Non-Lutherans.** — In the *Lutheran Encyclopedia* H. E. Jacobs says in praise of Muhlenberg: "He knew how to combine width of view and cordiality of friendship towards those of other communions, with strict adherence to principle." (331.) Similar views had been expressed by Dr. W. J. Mann at the First Free Lutheran Diet at Philadelphia. In his "Theses on the Lutheranism of the Fathers of the Church in This Country" he said: "Their Lutheranism did not differ from the Lutheran orthodoxy of the preceding period, in the matter of doctrine, but to an extent in the manner of applying it. It was orthodoxy practically vitalized. They were less polemical and theoretical. Whilst tolerant toward those of other convictions, they were, however, neither indifferent nor unionistically inclined, and never conformed Lutheranism to any other form of Christianity, though in their days the pressure in this direction was heavy." (Spaeth, *C. P. Krauth*, 1, 318.) However, though Muhlenberg's intentions undoubtedly were to be and remain a Lutheran, his fraternal intercourse and intimate fellowship with the Reformed, Episcopalians, Methodists, and other denominations, was of a nature incompatible with true Lutheranism. He evidently regarded the various Christian communions as sister churches, who had practically the same divine right to exist and to propagate their distinctive views as the Lutheran Church. Such was the principle of indifferentism on which Muhlenberg based his practise of fraternal recognition and fellowship. The natural and inevitable result of his relations with the sects was that the free, open, and necessary confession of Lutheran truth over against Reformed error was weakened and muffled, and finally smothered and entirely silenced and omitted. Nor can it be denied that Muhlenberg, by this unionism and indifferentism, wasted and corrupted much of the rich blessings which God bestowed, and purposed to bestow, on the American Lutheran Church through him. Like Dr. Wrangel and the Swedes in Delaware generally, Muhlenberg and his associates entertained the opinion that especially the Lutherans and Episcopalians were not separated by any essential doctrinal differences. Indeed, the Germans in Pennsylvania, like the Swedes in Dela-

ware, seem at times to have seriously considered a union between the Episcopalians and the Lutherans. In brief, Muhlenberg's attitude toward the Reformed and other sects was of a nature which cannot be justified as Lutheran nor construed as non-unionistic in character.

**53. The Facts in the Case.** — From the very beginning to the end of his activity in America the practise of Muhlenberg was not free from indifferentism and unionism. Already on his voyage across the ocean he had conducted services according to the Book of Common Prayer. (G., 322.) November 25, 1742, Muhlenberg had arrived in Philadelphia, and on December 28th of the same year he wrote in his journal: "In the afternoon I visited the English pastor of the Episcopal Church. He was very cordial, and informed me that he had always been a good friend of our Lutheran brethren, the Swedish missionaries, and desired to be on friendly terms also with me." (267.) In 1743 Muhlenberg signified his willingness to build a union church with the Reformed in case they were willing to shoulder their part of the expenses. (272.) In 1751 he reported from New York: "May 31, I visited Mr. Barclay, the most prominent pastor of the Anglican Church, whom the Archbishop has appointed commissioner of the province of New York. . . . The Dutch Reformed have at present four pastors. I called on the oldest of them, Mr. Du Bois, who received me cordially. Thereupon I visited the youngest of the Dutch Reformed Ministerium. I visited also the third member of this body, who, together with his wife, carried on a beautiful and edifying conversation, so that I was truly delighted." (421.) "June 28, I visited Mr. Pember-ton, the pastor of the English Presbyterian congregation, for the first time. He was much pleased with my short call, and remarked that he had received a letter from Pastor Tennent in Philadelphia, who had mentioned my name and advised him to cultivate my company. Almost immediately he began to speak of the sainted Professor Francke, saying that he had read several of his Latin works. Besides this we had several other edifying conversations. Upon my departure he asked me to visit him frequently." (422.) "July 22, my host and I drove to the oldest Reformed pastor, who gave us a cordial recep-

tion. In the afternoon we visited one of the elders of my congregation. In the evening the younger Reformed pastor visited me." (425.) "On the 23d I again preached in Dutch on the opening verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew. The two Reformed pastors and a large number of people were present." (425.) "August 17, I preached a penitential sermon and had confession. The church was filled with Lutherans and Reformed, among whom was also the younger pastor." (428.) "August 21, the members of the congregation who live near by, several Reformed neighbors, and a number of friends of New York assembled to hear my farewell sermon at that place." (429.) "May 11, our Dutch congregation-members who live near by, and some Reformed neighbors, were invited to attend an hour of edification." (434.) "In the afternoon I bade farewell to the younger Reformed pastor." (439.) "Early on Tuesday morning the Reformed Pastor Schlatter came to my home and embraced me after the custom of our old and unfeigned love." (439.) "In the evening I was called to the six Reformed pastors who had arrived. I went and welcomed them with the words: 'Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves.' July 30, I was taken to the pious English merchant, as he had some awakened souls with him. They sang a psalm, read a chapter from a devotional book, and in conclusion urged me to pray. After the dear souls had returned to their homes, I remained with him and had a very delightful and edifying conversation with him and his pious wife." (440.) Muhlenberg praises the Episcopalian Richard Peters as a "moderate theologian," possessed of a "catholic spirit," and reports in 1760: "On the ninth and tenth of August Mr. Richard Peters, secretary of the province and president of the Academy in Philadelphia, visited me in Providence. In the morning he attended our German service, with which, he said, he was greatly delighted. In the afternoon he himself delivered a very solid and edifying sermon to a large audience." (516.) After his removal to Philadelphia, in 1761, Muhlenberg wrote: "On Monday, March 16, I intended quietly to leave the city. However, Provost Wrangel as well as some of the elders accompanied me, the former as far as the home of Pastor Schlatter, where we were hospitably received and entertained for the

night." (380.) On the services conducted at Barren Hill on Easter Monday, 1762, Muhlenberg reports as follows: "After my sermon Pastor Schlatter added a short admonition, impressing upon them what they had already heard." (517.) "On Monday, May 25, I went out in the forenoon to visit some English friends. As I happened to pass by the English High Church at eleven o'clock, I was called into the manse, where I found a numerous assembly of the honorable English missionaries, who were conducting their annual meeting. They took me to church with them, showed me unmerited honor, and permitted me to attend their session as a friend and witness." (380.) May 21, 1762, Muhlenberg noted in his diary: "At noon I was with Mr. R., who related with joy how he, Mr. D., and Provost Wrangel, together with the new Swedish pastor, Mr. Wicksel, and the Reformed pastor, Schlatter, had yesterday, on Ascension Day, attended the new church, where they had heard two splendid and edifying sermons in German and English delivered to two large audiences." (383.) October 16, 1763, he wrote: "Pastor Handschuh was called upon to bury a Reformed woman who died in childbirth; he delivered the sermon in the old Reformed church." On October 18, 1763, during the sessions of Synod, and at its request, Whitefield preached in the pulpit of Muhlenberg. In 1767 J. S. Gerock dedicated his new church in New York, "assisted by different High German and English Protestant pastors and teachers," H. M. Muhlenberg and Hartwick also preaching. (444.) When Muhlenberg dedicated his new Zion Church in Philadelphia, on June 25, 1769, the professors of the Academy as well as the Episcopalian and Presbyterian pastors were invited. The report says: "The second English pastor, Mr. Duchee, opened the services by reading the English prayers, the Prorector of the Academy offered an appropriate prayer, and Commissioner Peters delivered a splendid sermon on the song of the angels, Luke 2, whereupon Rector Muhlenberg, in the name of the corporation and congregation, thanked the honorable assembly, in English, for their favor and kindness in honoring this newly erected church and conducting a service there." May 27, 1770, Whitefield, upon invitation, also preached in the new church. (518.) Without a word of censure on the part of his father, or of protest on the part of

Synod, Peter Muhlenberg, in 1772, at London, subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles and received Episcopal ordination, in order to be able to perform legal marriage ceremonies within his congregations in Virginia. Invited by the Presbyterian pastor, W. Tennent, Muhlenberg, Sr., preached in his church on two occasions while at Charleston, in 1774. (578.) At Savannah he preached in the union church of the Reformed Pastor Zuebli, and in the Lutheran church at Savannah he enjoyed the sermon of a Methodist pastor. (518.) At the church dedication in Pikestown, in 1775, he preached in German, and an Episcopalian, Mr. Currie, in English, etc.

**54. Whitefield in Muhlenberg's Pulpit.** — “The pastors of the first period of the Ministerium,” says Dr. Jacobs, “were on friendly relations with Whitefield. Dr. Wrangel interested himself in securing for him an invitation to meet with the members of the Ministerium during the sessions of 1763. In urging this proposition, Wrangel did not forget the collections which Whitefield had made in Europe for the impoverished Salzburgers. The presence of a man who had pleaded eloquently in English pulpits for contributions to build Lutheran churches in Georgia, and with that eminent success which Benjamin Franklin has noted in a well-known passage in his autobiography, certainly deserved recognition, even apart from Whitefield’s services in awakening life in the Church of England and in America. He was present at the examination of the children of St. Michael’s Church before the synod, made a fervent prayer and an edifying address. On the next day he bade the synod farewell, and requested the prayers of its members. The next year he was in attendance at the funeral of Pastor Handschuh. In 1770 (May 27) he preached by special invitation in Zion Church.” (286.) In his report, dated October 15, 1763, on the synod of the same year, Muhlenberg himself says: “It was also considered, whether we should not invite Mr. Whitefield and the two well-disposed preachers of the Episcopal Church for Monday and Tuesday, especially to the examination of the children. Among other reasons Dr. Wrangel mentioned the fact that Whitefield had assisted our poor suffering brethren in Georgia [Salzburgers] with collections. In the evening Dr. Wrangel took me to Mr. Whitefield, and in the

name of the Ministerium we invited him together with the rector of the High Church, who was present." October 16, Muhlenberg wrote: "After the services Dr. Wrangel, Pastor Handschuh, and three trustees went to Mr. Whitefield and asked him if on the morrow he would attend our examination in the church, and speak a word of admonition to the children. He answered: Yes, if his weakness permitted, and such were God's gracious will." October 18, Muhlenberg wrote: "Mr. Whitefield ascended the pulpit, and said a hearty and powerful prayer. Hereupon he addressed himself to the children, delivering, with tears and deep emotion, a condescending sermon about pious children of the Old and New Testaments, together with some modern examples which he had himself experienced, and finally enjoined upon parents their duties. After this the children were examined by Dr. Wrangel, and then, in German, by me. Whitefield, however, being very weak in body, and the church being very crowded, we discontinued and closed with a piece of church music. The pastors and other delegates, the elders and deacons took dinner in the school, the old Mr. Tenant [Episcopalian], who was given the place of honor, delighting us with edifying conversation." October 19, Muhlenberg wrote: "At four o'clock Mr. George Whitefield visited our Ministerium in the school, bidding us an affectionate farewell, and requesting us to intercede for him before the throne of grace." Dr. Graebner remarks: "A misstep as serious as this, admitting an errorist like Whitefield to the pulpit of the local pastor and synodical president, such as was done at this synodical meeting, had, at least, not been made before the time of Wrangel." (383 ff.) Concerning his fellowship with Whitefield in 1770, Muhlenberg made the following entries in his journal: "Friday, May 25. . . . Because I could not do otherwise, I wrote a few lines to Rev. Mr. Whitefield, stating that if he would preach for me on next Sunday night in Zion Church, it would be acceptable to me." "Sunday, May 27. . . . Early in the evening Zion Church was filled with people of all sorts of religion, both German and English. We two preachers went to Mr. Whitefield's lodging and took him with us to the church, which was so crowded that we had to take him in through the steeple-door. . . . He complained of a cold contracted at the morning service, and consequent hoarseness, but preached very

acceptably from 2 Chron. 7, 1 on 'The Outer and the Inner Glory of the House of God.' He introduced some impressive remarks concerning our fathers — Francke and Ziegenhagen, etc." (Jacobs, 287.) At the First Lutheran Diet, Dr. C. P. Krauth explained: "Whitefield was an evangelist of forgotten or ignored doctrines of the Gospel; a witness excluded from many pulpits of his own church because of his earnestness in preaching the truth; in some sense a martyr. This invested him with interest in the eyes of our fathers, and his love to the Lutheran Church and his services to it made him very dear." (287.)

**55. Experiencing the Consequences.** — From what has been said it is evident that Muhlenberg's relations with the sects was not without reprehensible unionism. Even where, in such fellowship, syncretism was not directly practised, the proper confession of Lutheran truth was omitted. As with the Swedes in Delaware, fraternal intercourse proceeded on the silent understanding that the sore spot of doctrinal differences must be carefully avoided. For Lutherans, however, this was tantamount to a denial of the truth. Muhlenberg set an example the influence of which was all the more pernicious by reason of the high esteem in which he was held by the members of Synod, who revered him as a father. As late as 1866 the Pennsylvania Synod defended its intercourse with the Reformed Synod "as a measure introduced by the fathers in the time of Muhlenberg and Schlatter." And the unionistic practises indulged in by the General Synod throughout its history cannot but be viewed as the fruits of the tree first planted by the Halle emissaries. Nor could they fail to see the abyss into which such unionism must finally lead, as it was apparent already in the history of the Swedes. That Muhlenberg had a presentiment whither things were drifting appears from his warning in 1783 to J. L. Voigt not to open his pulpit to Methodist preachers. (516.) Indeed, Muhlenberg himself lived to see the first bitter fruits of his dalliance with the sects. Four months before his end, June 6, 1787, Franklin College, at Lancaster, was solemnly opened as a German High School and a union theological seminary for Lutherans, Reformed, and a number of other sects. H. E. Muhlenberg delivered the ser-

mon at the opening exercises, which were attended by the entire synod. The name of the institution was chosen in view of the virtues and merits of Benjamin Franklin, who had contributed £200. The College had forty-five trustees, consisting of 15 Lutherans, 15 Reformed, and 15 chosen from other communions. A director was to be chosen alternately from the Lutheran and from the Reformed Church. Among the first trustees were J. H. C. Helmuth and other Lutheran pastors. Two of the first four teachers were Lutherans: Pastor H. E. Muhlenberg, the first director, and Pastor F. W. Melsheimer. (515.) Dr. A. Spaeth, agreeing with W. J. Mann, says: "Sooner or later the whole Lutheran Church of America should and could unite on the position of Muhlenberg." (252.) We would not detract from the merit of Muhlenberg. The slogan of the American Lutheran Church, however, dare never be: "Back to Muhlenberg!" "Back to Halle!" but "Back to Wittenberg!" "Back to Luther! Back to Lutheran sincerity, determination, and consistency both in doctrine and practise!"

#### TRAINING OF MINISTERS AND TEACHERS NEGLECTED.

**56. Parish Schools Cultivated.** — One cannot possibly say too much in praise of the missionary zeal on the part of Muhlenberg and his associates and of their unceasing efforts to establish new mission-posts and organize new congregations, and to obtain additional laborers from Europe, notably from Halle. In a large measure this applies also to their labors in the interest of establishing parochial schools. In fact, wherever we read of early Lutherans in America, especially German Lutherans, there we also hear the cry for schools and school-teachers to instruct the children. Comparatively weak efforts to establish schools for their children were made by the Swedes in Delaware. At Christina a teacher was employed in 1699; in Wicaco Teacher Hernboom began a school in 1713. The minutes of the Pennsylvania Synod of 1762 record: "In the Swedish congregations the Swedish schools have for several generations been regrettably neglected; Dr. Wrangel, however, has started an English school in one of his congregations in which the Lutheran Catechism is read in an English trans-

lation." Acrelius, who had been provost of the Swedes in Delaware, wrote in 1759: "Forty years back our people scarcely knew what a school was. The first Swedish and Holland settlers were a poor, weak, and ignorant people, who brought up their children in the same ignorance." The result was great ignorance among the Swedes. *Jacobs*: "There seems to have been an entire dearth of laymen capable of intelligently participating in the administration of the affairs of the congregation until we come to Peter Kock. Eneberg found at Christina that 'of the vestrymen and elders of the parish there was scarcely any one who could write his own name.'" (104.) The Salzburgers had a school in Ebenezer, and later a second school in the country. At the beginning Bolzius and Gronau gave daily instruction in religion, the one four, the other three hours daily. In 1741 Ortmann and an English teacher instructed the youth at Ebenezer. The Palatinates in New York began with the building, not only of a church, but also of a school in 1710, the very year in which they had settled at West Camp. In New York there was a schoolhouse as well as a church, and a "schoolkeeper" (*Schulhalter*) was employed. When the teacher disappeared, the schoolhouse was rented out, but Berkenmeyer taught the children in his home for five months in a year, three times a week. Also in North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, etc., parish schools were established, and the great need of them explained to and urged upon the people by the conferences and ministers. In Pennsylvania there were several German schools even before the arrival of Muhlenberg; as a rule, however, the teachers were incompetent or immoral, or both. (247.) When, in 1734, Daniel Weisiger, one of the representatives of the congregations at Philadelphia, New Hanover, and Providence, made his appearance in Halle, he asked for both an able and pious preacher and a schoolteacher. In the beginning Muhlenberg himself took charge of the school. In January, 1743, he wrote: "Because there is a great ignorance among the youth of this land and good school-teachers are so very rare, I shall be compelled to take hold of the work myself. Those who possibly could teach the youth to read are lazy and drunken, compile a sermon from all manner of books, run about, preach, and administer the Lord's Supper for hard cash. Miserable and disgusting, indeed! I an-

nounced to the people [at Providence] to send first their oldest children for instruction, as I intended to remain with the congregation eight days at a time. On Monday some of the parents brought their children. It certainly looks depressing when children of seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty years come with the *Abc-Book*. Yet I am delighted that they are possessed of so great a desire to learn something," etc. "In Providence," Muhlenberg wrote later on, "I have a splendid young man, who keeps school in winter, and in summer earns his living by doing manual labor." In 1745 J. N. Kurtz and J. H. Schaum were sent from Halle to take charge of the youth. One of the chief questions to engage the attention of the first convention of the Pennsylvania Synod, in 1748, was: "What is the condition of the parish schools?" Brunnholtz reported: In his home at Philadelphia, Schaum, whom he supported, had been keeping school for three and a half years; since Easter there had been no school, as Schaum was needed at another place; however, before winter would set in, he and his elders would do their best in this matter. Germantown, continued Brunnholtz, had two teachers, Doeling, a former Moravian, being one of them, whose schools were attended by many children, some of them non-Lutherans. Another school near Germantown with twenty children had been closed for lack of a teacher. Muhlenberg stated: In Providence there had been a small school in the past year. New Hanover had a fair school, Jacob Loeser being teacher. Though a teacher could be had for the filials Saceum and Upper Milford, there were no schools there. When the elders hereupon explained that the distances were too great, Synod advised to change off monthly with the teacher, and demanded an answer in this matter in the near future. Kurtz promised to begin a school at Tulpehocken in winter. Handschuh reported: In Lancaster the school was flourishing; Teacher Schmidt and his assistant Vigera had instructed 70 children. At the meeting of Synod in 1753 the pastors complained: "The schools within our congregations are in a very poor state, since able and faithful teachers are rare, salaries utterly insufficient, the members too widely scattered and in most cases poor, roads too bad in winter, and the children too urgently needed on the farms in summer." (G., 496.) According to the report of the Synod held in 1762 there were

parochial schools in New Providence, one main school and several smaller ones; in New Hanover; in Philadelphia, where a public examination during the sessions of Synod exhibited the efficiency of the school; in Vincent Township, a school with a good teacher and 60 children; in Reading, a school with more than 80 children; in Tulpehocken, a school of 40 children; in Heidelberg, a school of 30 children; in Northkeel, 30 children, taught by Pastor Kurtz; in Lancaster, a school of 60 children in summer and 90 in winter, etc. (495.)

**57. Dearth of Pastors and Schoolteachers.** — From the very beginning one of the greatest obstacles to the spread and healthy growth of the Lutheran Church in America was the dearth of well-trained, able, and truly Lutheran pastors and schoolteachers. And the greatest of all mistakes of the early builders of the American Zion was the failure to provide for the crying need of laborers by the only proper and effectual means — the establishment of American seminaries for the training of truly Lutheran pastors and teachers qualified to serve in American surroundings. The growing indifferentism and deterioration of the Lutheran ministry as well as of the Lutheran congregations was a necessary consequence of this neglect, which resulted in an inadequate service, rendered, to a large extent, by incompetent or heterodox ministers. Dr. Mann was right when he maintained in his *Plea for the Augsburg Confession* of 1856, that the doctrinal aberrations of the Definite Platform theologians were due, in part, to the fact that S. S. Schmucker and other ministers had received their theological education at Princeton and other non-Lutheran schools. The constantly increasing need, coupled with the insufficient preparation of the men willing to serve, led to the pernicious system of licensing, which for many decades became a permanent institution in Pennsylvania and other States. In 1857 the General Synod adopted the following report: "The committee on the Licensure System respectfully report that the action of this body requesting the several District Synods to take into consideration and report their judgment on the proposed alteration or abolition of our Licensure System has been responded to by fifteen synods. Out of this number all the synods, excepting three, have decided against a change. Your

committee have to report the judgment of the Church to be decidedly against any change of our long-established regulations on this subject, and therefore deem it unnecessary to enter on the discussion of the merits of the subject, in this report, and propose the adoption of the following resolution: Resolved, That the great majority of our Synods having expressed their judgment against any change in our Licensure System, your committee be released from the further consideration of the subject." (20.) The great dearth of ministers accounted for this action. Even before 1727 there were in Pennsylvania more than 50,000 Germans. In 1751 Benjamin Franklin expressed his apprehension that "the Palatine boors" would Germanize Pennsylvania. In 1749 more than 12,000 German emigrants arrived. In 1750 the Germans in Pennsylvania numbered about 80,000, almost one-half of the inhabitants of the State. And more than one-half of these were considered Lutherans. In 1811, however, when this number had greatly increased, the Pennsylvania Synod reported only 64 ministers, of whom 34 were ordained, 26 were licensed to preach, and 4 were catechists. The number of ministers sent from Germany had been augmented by such as had been tutored by pastors in America. Chr. Streit and Peter Muhlenberg, for example, were instructed by Provost Wrangel and Muhlenberg, Sr. Another pupil of Muhlenberg was Jacob van Buskirk. H. Moeller, D. Lehman, and others had studied under J. C. Kunze. Jacob Goering, J. Bachman, C. F. L. Endress, J. G. Schmucker, Miller, and Baetis were pupils of J. H. Ch. Helmuth. H. A. Muhlenberg, who subsequently became prominent in politics, and B. Keller were educated in Franklin College. Later on some attended Princeton and other Reformed schools to prepare themselves for the Lutheran ministry! To make matters worse, the ministers who, toward the close of the eighteenth century, came from Germany were no longer adapted for their surroundings, which were rapidly becoming English. Besides, Halle and the other German universities had grown rationalistic. According to the Report of the General Synod in 1823 the Lutheran Church in America numbered 900 churches with only 175 ministers. (9.) The same report states: "The ancient and venerable Synod of Pennsylvania is rapidly increasing both in members and in ministers, and we trust that

much good is doing in the name of our blessed Savior Jesus. From the minutes of the session of the present year, which was held at Lebanon, it appears that the body consists of 74 ministers, who have the pastoral charge of upwards of 278 churches; that between the session of 1822 and 1823 they admitted to membership by baptism 6,445, admitted to sacramental communion by confirmation 2,750, that the whole number of communicants is 24,794, and that there are under the superintendence of the different churches 208 congregational schools." (11.) In 1843, according to the *Lutheran Almanac* for that year, the General Synod numbered 424 ordained and licensed pastors and 1,374 congregations with 146,303 communicants. This averaged three congregations for every pastor, some serving as many as six, eight, or even twelve, giving the majority of the congregations one service every four weeks, and to many only one service every eight weeks. (*Kirchl. Mitt.* 1843, No. 11.) In 1853 about 9,000 Lutheran congregations in the United States were served by only 900 pastors. (*Lutheraner*, 10, 31.) Thus, as the years rolled on, the question became increasingly pressing: "Where shall we find pastors for our children?" Yet, while the Lutheran ministers, as a rule, were most zealous and self-sacrificing in their labors to serve and gather the scattered Lutherans, organize congregations, and establish parochial schools, the early history of American Lutheranism does not record a single determined effort anywhere to provide in a systematic way for the training of preachers and teachers, such as were required by American conditions and surroundings. We hear of an orphan home founded by the Salzburgers in 1737 with three boys and eight girls, but nowhere of a seminary turning out preachers and teachers for the maintenance and upbuilding of the Church. It was in 1864, more than 120 years after the first appearance of Muhlenberg in Pennsylvania, that the "Mother Synod" of the Lutheran Church in America founded a seminary in Philadelphia.

**58. Hopeless Situation.**—Several years after his arrival in America, Muhlenberg realized the need and conceived the thought of founding an orphan asylum with a preachers' seminary in connection; and in 1748 he had acquired the ground for this purpose. In his letters to Halle he repeatedly declared

that it would be impossible to supply "the almost innumerable multitude of German Lutherans" with pastors for any length of time without a seminary in America. In one of these letters he says: "An institution of this kind does not appear to be impossible. And it seems to be necessary, because, as the past experience has taught us, the calling of well-tried and able preachers from Germany, though indeed of especial advantage, and needed also in the future, at least for a considerable time, is connected with so many difficulties and such great expense that it will be impossible to send over as many from Germany as will be required in order to provide sufficiently for all congregations." (504.) In 1769 Muhlenberg broached the matter to the convention of the Ministerium, and Synod repeatedly considered the question. But nothing materialized. Indeed, J. C. Kunze, who later became Muhlenberg's son-in-law, finally did succeed in opening a preparatory school; lack of funds, however, compelled him to close it during the Revolutionary War. Kunze, Helmuth, and J. F. Schmidt now pinned their hopes to the "German Institute" of the Pennsylvania University, whose professors were Lutherans from 1779 to 1822. Helmuth instructed every day from eight to twelve and from two to five o'clock. But the "German Institute" did not turn out any Lutheran pastors, as the curriculum contained no course in theology. Kunze writes: "It is true, I was professor of Oriental languages in Philadelphia. However, I had but six scholars, and I doubt if one of them will study theology. And who would instruct them, in case they should desire to study theology? We did not have time to devote a single hour to this subject in Philadelphia." In 1785 Helmuth and Schmidt wrote: "There is nothing we pastors desire more than a German educational institution, where young men could be prepared directly for the service of the Church. To be sure, we have part in the university located here, and also make use of it. But languages and philosophy only are taught here, from which our churches and schools derive no benefit." The hopelessness of the situation is further revealed by the following letter which Helmuth addressed to the synod assembled in Lancaster, Pa., 1784: "Brethren, we are living in a sad time. My heart weeps over the awful decay of Christendom. I readily

acknowledge my share of the guilt that God seems to hide His countenance from us, permitting the doors to stand wide open, for the spirit of lies [rationalism] to enter and destroy the vineyard of the Lord. You will learn from the report from Halle how the swine are uprooting the garden of Christ in Germany. . . . Another thing, dearest brethren, how shall we in the future supply our congregations with pastors? Where shall we find ministers to meet our need, which will increase from time to time? From Germany? Possibly a secret Arian, Socinian, or Deist? For over there everything is full of this vermin. God forbid! Under present circumstances, no one from Germany! We ourselves must put our hands to the plow. God will call us to account for it, and will let our children suffer for it, if we do not wake up, and hazard something for the weal of immortal souls." — And how did they now seek to provide help? Franklin College was founded in conjunction with the German Reformed and other sects! Helmuth and other Lutheran pastors were among the trustees of the institution. In an appeal to the Lutheran congregations they say: "Where will you at last find pastors and teachers if you do not send your children to college? . . . Think you that your churches and schools can exist without them? Either your children will have to content themselves with the poorest kind of men, or else surrender language and religion, for which you have laid the foundation, thus loading a great guilt upon yourselves. Dear friends, German church-life can impossibly continue to exist as it has hitherto existed in many places. In a few years the churches you already have will be deserted. And what will then become of the increased number of Germans dwelling in your midst? Are there not already a great number of localities where the inhabitants hear no sermon for six to eight weeks, and where the young grow up like the savages?" (515. 530.) The Synod of 1818 also staked its hopes on Franklin College, which, however, was eking out a pitiable existence, and finally became the exclusive property of the Reformed. The dire need was apparent to all; the true way out of the difficulty, however, no one saw nor wanted to see. And the reason? Avarice on the part of the congregations, and a lack of initiative and Lutheran earnestness and determination on the part of the pastors. Nor did the seminaries founded in

the first part of the nineteenth century (Hartwick Seminary, established in 1815; Gettysburg Seminary, in 1825; and the seminary of the South Carolina Synod, in 1829, at Lexington) meet the needs of the Church, either as to the quantity or the quality of the candidates required for the Lutheran ministry. In a letter addressed to the General Synod, assembled 1827 at Gettysburg, Dr. Hazelius wrote: "Our [Hartwick] Seminary has been established since the year 1815; during which time 11 young men have received their theological education here, 10 of whom are now actively engaged as laborers in the vineyard of our Lord; but one is prevented by disease from participating in the labors of his brethren." (20.) All told, 10 preachers produced by Lutheran seminaries in the United States till 1827! Besides, in reality these seminaries were not Lutheran, but unionistic and, in a degree, Reformed schools.

#### DETERIORATION OF MOTHER SYNOD.

**59. Descent Increasingly Swift.** — The Lutheran Church has always held that, as faith cannot and must not be coerced, the broadest tolerance as to matters of conscience and religion should govern the policy of the State everywhere. On the other hand, the Lutheran Church maintains that, as truth is absolutely intolerant of error, and error is the direct denial of truth, the Christian Church dare not in any shape or manner give recognition to false teaching, but, on the contrary, is bound always to reject it and to confess God's truth alone. Indifferentism as to false doctrine and practise has ever proved to be the most deadly foe of true Lutheranism, which, essentially, is but another name for consistent Christianity. Lutheranism and doctrinal indifferentism are just as destructive mutually as are truth and falsehood. Also the history of the Pennsylvania Synod offers ample proof of this law. In the days of Muhlenberg, Lutherans began to doubt that their doctrinal position, as presented in the Lutheran Symbols, alone is of divine right in the Christian Church, and alone in complete keeping with the Scriptures. Then they began to defend themselves as also being in the right and standing for truth; then, to apologize for their presence in America; then, to be ashamed of themselves and publicly to deny the distinctive

tenets of Lutheranism; and, finally, to oppose its doctrines, champion their counterpart, and practically embrace sectarianism. Muhlenberg had lived to see the beginning of the end of true Lutheranism when Franklin College was opened. The descent was increasingly swift. In 1792 the confession of the Lutheran Symbols was omitted in the new constitution of the Ministerium. And when, under the influence of Quitman, the New York Ministerium became rationalistic, the Pennsylvania Synod made no protest, administered no rebuke, and did not sever its fraternal relations with it. Moreover, in a measure, they opened their own doors to Rationalism; the German language was regarded as being of greater import than faithful adherence to the Lutheran Confessions; and refuge against the inroads of Rationalism and the English language was sought in a union with the German Reformed and the German Moravians. The utter degeneration of the Pennsylvania Synod appears from the new Agenda, concerning which Synod resolved in 1818 that it be introduced in all German congregations of the Ministerium. In this Book there were embodied also forms designed to satisfy the Rationalists. Two of the forms for administering the Sacrament of Baptism contained no confession of faith. The confession to the Lutheran Church was stricken from the form for Confirmation. In two of the forms for the administration of the Lord's Supper the Union formula of distribution was employed, *viz.*, "Jesus says: Take and eat — Jesus says: Take and drink ye all of it," etc. The second form contained the following general invitation: "In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master, I say to all who acknowledge Him as their Savior, and are determined to be His faithful followers: You are welcome at this Feast of Love." (669.) The second formula for burials had a rationalistic tang. And the formulas of ordination and licensure no longer demanded adherence to the Lutheran Confessions. (669.)

**60. Intrenching behind the German Language.** — The Christian Church, hence also the Lutheran Church, views every language, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as well as German and English, not as an end, but always as a means only toward furthering her real end, the regeneration and salvation of souls. According to Loche's *Kirchliche Mitteilungen* of 1845, No. 5,

a German emigrant wrote shortly after his arrival in America: "I cannot sufficiently thank God for the grace bestowed upon me; for when I for the first time heard the language of Canaan [English], the language of the New Jerusalem, I was immediately and deeply moved by the Spirit of God and was caught like tinder." This was certainly not the attitude of the German Lutheran ministers of the Pennsylvania Synod, some of whom, going to the other extreme, were in danger of viewing the English, as compared with the German, as impregnated with the spirit of rationalism and infidelity. Riding, as it were, on the language, rationalism had made its public entry into the New York Ministerium. The real cause, however, was not the language, but the indifferentism and unionism prevailing within this body, which long ago had paved the way for, indeed, had itself bred, religious unbelief. However, mistaking what was merely accidental and a concomitant for the chief and real cause of the calamity in the New York Ministerium, prominent German ministers of the Pennsylvania Synod, in order to guard against a similar turn of events in their own midst, frantically opposed the use of the English language in the Synod and her congregations, and placed such emphasis on the German as made it an end *per se* peculiar to the Lutheran Church rather than a means employed wherever and whenever the conditions call for it in order to attain her real and supreme object — the saving of souls. Men like J. H. C. Helmuth and J. F. Schmidt, in a way, identified English and Rationalism, German and Lutheranism (that is to say, unionistic Evangelicalism). Lamenting the inroads that Rationalism was making also in Lutheran congregations, they wrote: "But now the Protestant churches are threatened by a terrible storm, which is not the mere consequence of the natural course of things, but a *sign of this time*, and it will soon despoil them of the treasures of their Church together with all their happiness, unless teachers and parents will counteract it with united strength. Almost universally, especially in the cities and at the boundaries, they are beginning to educate the children exclusively in the English language, and, in a manner for which they will not be able to answer, to neglect them as regards the German services. This is the consequence of the indifference and the disregard of sound doc-

trine which, in the present hour of great temptation, is spreading over the face of the earth." But instead of stemming the tide of Rationalism by returning to Lutheran faithfulness, they ignored the Lutheran Confessions and intrenched themselves behind the German language and the "brethren" in the German Reformed and German Moravian churches. The general church-prayer of the Agenda of 1786, universally introduced in the congregations of the Pennsylvania Synod, contained the passage: "And since it has pleased Thee [God] to transform this State [Pennsylvania] into a blooming garden, the deserts into delightful meadows, grant that we may not forget our nation, but strive to have our dear youth educated in such a manner that German churches and schools may not only be maintained, but brought to a flourishing condition, ever increasing." (494.) In 1812 the *Evangelisches Magazin* appeared "under the auspices of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod," Pastors Helmuth and Schmidt being the editors. Its avowed purpose, however, was not to represent Lutheranism, but specifically to bolster up the cause of the German and to oppose the introduction of the English language. The "Proposal to Synod" concerning the new German paper states: "1. We want to aid the German language as much as we can, because we are convinced that, with her language, our Church will lose unspeakably much, and, finally, for the most part, even her very existence under her [Lutheran] name. 2. We know the days of the great apostasy in Europe. . . . Also this devouring monster could be counteracted by a well-arranged *Evangelisches Magazin*." (544.) In 1813 the *Magazin* contained a series of articles urging the Reformed and Lutherans to stand together against all attempts at introducing English. The English language, it is said, is too poor to furnish an adequate translation of the German prayers and hymns and books of devotion. English congregations could not remain either Lutheran or Reformed, because "our religious writings are all German." Revealing his Utopian dreams, the writer continues: "What would Philadelphia be in forty years if the Germans there were to remain German, and retain their language and customs? It would not be forty years until Philadelphia would be a German city, just as York and Lancaster are German counties. . . . What would be the result through-

out Pennsylvania and Northern Maryland in forty or fifty years? An entirely German State, where, as formerly in Germantown, the beautiful German language would be used in the legislative halls and the courts of justice." (Jacobs, 330.) In 1805 the Pennsylvania Synod resolved that "this Ministerium must remain a German-speaking body"—a resolution which, especially in Philadelphia, merely served to increase the humiliating and damaging language-strife which had begun several decades before.

#### UNIONISM IN THE ASCENDENCY.

**61. Seeking Refuge with the Reformed.** — In their struggle against Rationalism and the English language the German Lutherans of Pennsylvania sought help in an alliance with the German Reformed and the Moravians. Fellowship between them became increasingly intimate. "Luther and Zwingli," they boasted harmoniously, "opened the eyes of the world!" "After all," they kept on saying, "there is but one faith, one Baptism, one Supper, no matter how much the Lutheran and Reformed views on it may be at variance." (539.) One of the objects of the German *Evangelical Magazine* evidently was to bring about a more intimate union between all German Evangelical bodies. For this reason it was not called "Lutheran," but "Evangelical." The preface to the first volume declared: "Our undertaking would be greatly furthered if the brethren of other communions would beautify it with their pious contributions, and also solicit subscriptions. The brethren of the Moravian Unity have expressed their satisfaction with this imperfect work, and assured us of their abiding love in this point." (544.) In view of the celebration of the Reformation Jubilee, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, at York, June 2, 1817, resolved that the German Reformed, Moravian, Episcopal, and Presbyterian churches be invited by our President to take part with us in the festival of the Reformation. In the following year the unionistic and rationalistic Agenda characterized above was adopted by the Ministerium. A committee was also appointed to confer with the German Reformed, and to devise plans for utilizing Franklin College as a theological seminary, in order to prepare ministers for both denominations. In 1819, at Lancaster, Pa., Synod again

considered the proposition of founding a joint seminary at Lancaster, and appropriated the sum of \$100 for this purpose on condition that the Reformed Synod set aside an equal amount. A committee was also appointed to confer with a similar committee of the Reformed, and to draw up the necessary plans for the seminary. During this time, especially in the period of 1817 to 1825, prominent men of the Pennsylvania Synod considered and advocated plans for an organic "general union of our Church in this country with the Evangelical Reformed Church." (685.) The Pennsylvania minutes of 1822 contain a notice according to which Endress and W. A. Muhlenberg were among the chief advocates of this movement. Many, especially in the Pennsylvania and North Carolina synods, regarded and zealously urged the union of all Lutheran synods in a General Synod as a step in this direction, *viz.*, union with the Reformed. Graebner says: "When all the Lutherans had been organized into one general body, and had grown accustomed to marching together, one might also hope to experience that when the command for the greater union would be given, the entire Lutheran people, now freed from Lutheranism, would march in stately procession to the goal of Schober's Morning Star [union of all Evangelical churches]. This was evidently the policy and ulterior object when, at Harrisburg, 1818, the Pennsylvania Synod resolved that 'the officers of Synod be a standing correspondence committee to bring about, if possible, a union with the other Lutheran synods.'" (685.) Viewed in its historical context (the favorable deliberations and resolutions on the union seminary, the union hymn-book, etc.), this resolution admits of no other interpretation. When, therefore, the organization of the General Synod seemed, in the opinion of many, to interfere with and threaten the projected union with the Reformed, the Pennsylvania Synod promptly withdrew from this body, in 1823. Says Jacobs: "The form of the opposition [to the General Synod] was that the General Synod interfered with the plans that had been projected for a closer union with the Reformed, and the establishment of a Lutheran-Reformed theological seminary. Congregations in Lehigh County petitioned the synod, for this reason, to 'return to the old order of things'; and the synod, in the spirit of charity [?] toward its congregations, in order that nothing might inter-

rupt the mutual fraternal love that subsisted between the brethren, consented, by a vote of seventy-two to nine, to desert the child which it had brought into being." (361.)

**62. Union Reformation Jubilee of 1817.**—At York, June 2, 1817, the Pennsylvania Synod resolved to celebrate the tercentenary of the Reformation together with the Reformed, the Episcopalians, etc. Invitations were extended accordingly. In his answer of October 14, 1817, Bishop William White of the Episcopal Church wrote to Pastor Lochman, expressing his delight at the prospect of taking part in the prospective celebration. He said: "I received the letter with which you honored me, dated July 23, 1817. In answer I take occasion to inform you that it will give me great satisfaction to join with the reverend ministers and with the whole body of the Lutheran Church, in this city, on the day appointed, in returning thanks to Almighty God for the beginning of the blessed Reformation in the three-hundredth year preceding, and in raising up for that purpose the great and good man who has transmitted to your Church his name, and whose praise is in all the churches of the Reformation. This occasion must, of course, be the more welcome to me on account of the agreement in doctrine which has always been considered as subsisting between the Lutheran churches and the Church of England, the mother of that of which I am a minister." (Jacobs, 356.) In his sermon at Frederick, Md., D. F. Schaeffer declared that it is noteworthy that both Luther and Calvin "were agreed on all points, with the exception of one which was of minor importance." The congregation sang according to the tune of "Wie schoen leuchtet der Morgenstern": "One hundred years, thrice told this day, By heavenly grace truth's radiant ray Beamed through the Reformation; Yea, glorious as Aurora's light Dispels the gloomy mists of night, Dawn'd on the world salvation. Luther! Zwingli! Joined with Calvin! From error's sin The church to free Restored religious liberty." In Yorktown a German cantata was sung from which we quote, according to the original, as follows: "Chor: Heute vor dreihundert Jahr, Strahlte Licht aus Gottes-thron, Durch die Reformation. Luther, Deutschlands hoechste Zier, Stund der Kirche Jesu fuer. Solo: Aber Welch ein

Widerstand! Solo: Luther war mit Gott verwandt. Duetto: Seiner Lehre heller Schein, Drang in tausend Herzen ein, Drang in tausend Herzen ein. Pause: Zwingel kam Und Calvin, Traten auf in Christi Sinn; Duetto: Und verbreiten Licht und Heil Segensvoll in ihrem Teil. Ganzer Chor: Millionen feiern heut', Dankbar froh' im hoeh'ren Ton, Dieses Fest dem Menschensohn." (G., 665.)

**63. Reformed and Lutheran Minutes on Lancaster Seminary.** — From 1817 to 1825 the Synod of Pennsylvania and the German Reformed Church were engaged in devising plans and adopting measures looking to the establishment of a united theological seminary for the education of the ministers of both the Reformed and Lutheran Churches. According to the minutes of the two bodies the respective actions taken were as follows: Minutes of the German Reformed Synod, 1817: "The committee on the founding of a literary institution reported further, recommending that two committees be appointed, consisting of three persons each, the one to confer with a committee of the New York Synod [Dutch Reformed] and the other with the Lutheran Synod. Resolved, That the Rev. Messrs. Pomp and Saml. Helffenstein be the committee to the New York Synod, and the Rev. Messrs. Hendel, Hoffmeier, and Wack, Sr., the committee to the Lutheran Synod." (11.) Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, 1818: "At this point, Revs. H. Hoffmeier, E. Wack, and W. Hendel appeared before the synod as a committee from the Reformed Synod of this State, and presented the following communication in writing, namely: An extract from the minutes of the Reformed Synod held at York, September 9, 1817. Mr. Hoffmeier having explained this whole subject more particularly to Synod, it was thereupon resolved, That a committee be appointed to confer with our esteemed brethren of the Reformed Synod in respect to the subject under consideration. The Messrs. J. George Schmucker, Conrad Jaeger, and H. A. Muhlenberg were named as this committee." "The committee appointed yesterday to confer with the committee of the Reformed Synod, and to make inquiry as to the way in which a union seminary for the education of young men for the ministerial office in both churches could be best established, presented the following report: '1. That they

have attended to the duty assigned them, and have had under consideration the fact that in the city of Lancaster there is an institution already in existence, known by the name of Franklin College. . . . 2. That the committee greatly regret that this institution has hitherto been neglected, and consequently the object to which it was originally devoted by the State has altogether failed of attainment. 3. That the committee has examined the charter of said institution with care, and finds it necessary to recommend that the president thereof be instructed to make arrangements for holding a meeting of all its trustees. 4. That Messrs. Hoffmeier and Endress see to it that such a meeting be held. 5. That a committee be appointed by both synods, who shall conjointly prepare a plan setting forth how this institution can be best adapted to the accomplishment of the purpose aforementioned.' The above report was received with general favor, and Messrs. Schmucker, Lochman, Geissenhainer, Sr., Endress, and Muhlenberg were appointed the committee provided for in section five of the report." (7. 8.) Minutes of German Reformed Synod, 1818: "The committee which was appointed to confer with a committee of the Lutheran Synod in reference to the founding of a theological school reported that they attended the Lutheran Synod of last year, and were received in a very fraternal manner; and that that Synod has appointed a committee to confer after the present meeting with a committee of the Reformed Synod on any subjects relating to the school, and to submit something definite; and they proposed that a similar committee be appointed. The proposition of the committee was accepted, and Revs. J. W. Hoffmeier, F. Herman, Sr., Wm. Hendel, Thos. Pomp, and S. Helffenstein were appointed such committee." At the same meeting a committee which had been appointed to confer with a similar committee from the Reformed Dutch Church, in reference to uniting with it in establishing a theological seminary, reported, stating that, inasmuch as negotiations were in progress with reference to uniting with other Germans in Pennsylvania, who have a common interest in property voted to them by the State Legislature for the support of a German institution [at Lancaster], nothing definite could at present be done in the matter. (6.) Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, 1819: "Pastor Endress made a verbal report in behalf

of the committee appointed the previous year to confer with a committee of the Reformed Synod in regard to the matter of Franklin College in Lancaster. Resolved, That the sum of \$100 be appropriated out of our synodical treasury toward the support of the college in Lancaster, provided the same be done by the Reformed Synod. Resolved, That a committee be appointed on our part who shall, at the next meeting of the Reformed Synod in Lancaster, in conjunction with a committee from this latter body, draw up a plan for a theological seminary. Resolved, That the Pastors Schmucker, Endress, Lochman, Muhlenberg, and Ernst constitute said committee. Resolved, That, through Mr. Endress, fifty copies of the minutes of synod of this year be forwarded to the Reformed Synod, shortly to convene at Lancaster." (15.) Minutes of Reformed Synod, 1819: "Proposed and resolved that a committee of five be appointed to confer with a committee of the Lutheran Synod in reference to the founding of a union theological institution, with authority to devise the plan necessary for the purpose. The committee consists of Revs. Hoffmeier, Hendel, Pomp, Becker, and Saml. Helffenstein." "The committee of the Lutheran and Reformed Synods to consider the matter relating to a theological seminary have prepared a plan for this purpose, and carefully examined the same, and found that such a theological seminary would be not only exceedingly useful for our youth preparing for the ministerial office, but also can easily be established. The committee, therefore, submit this plan to the Rev. Synod, and, at the same time, request the Rev. Synod to have the plan printed, in order that it may be circulated among the members of both synods, to afford each one an opportunity to examine it carefully for himself, because the time for this purpose is at present too short. The committee of the Rev. Lutheran Synod proposes to pay half the expenses of printing, and recommended that two hundred copies thereof be printed." "It was proposed and resolved, that fifty copies of the proceedings of the present Synod be transmitted to the Rev. Lutheran Synod as an evidence of our gratitude and mutual respect." (7. 19.) Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, Lancaster, May 28, 1820: "The president of synod made a verbal report in behalf of the committee that had been appointed, in conjunction with a committee of the Reformed Synod, last September at Lan-

easter to draw up and publish a plan for a union seminary. From this report it appears that the members of our committee were not all present; that the joint committee did actually prepare a plan; that the printing of the same was entrusted to Revs. Endress and Hoffmeier, but that this duty was not attended to. Dr. Endress arose and made a long speech in defense of himself, referring to a number of local reasons and certain misunderstandings that influenced him to omit the publication of the plan. To this it was replied that the reasons given by him were not altogether satisfactory. Candidate Schnee arose and gave synod an account of an institution located at Middletown, Pa., known as 'The Fry's Orphans' Home.' He awakened the joyful hope that by the blessing of the Lord it might be possible at some future time to establish at that place a theological seminary for the Lutheran Church in this country. Dr. Lochman arose and made a powerful speech in favor of establishment of a theological seminary, and of supporting the college at Lancaster. Resolved, That a committee be appointed to attend the meeting of the Reformed Synod shortly to be held at Hagerstown; that Revs. D. F. Schaeffer and B. Kurtz constitute said committee." (19. 20.) Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, Chambersburg, 1821: "Revs. Hoffman and Rahausen, deputies of the German Reformed Synod, took seats as advisory members. Resolved, That Rev. Mr. Denny, pastor of the Presbyterian church at Chambersburg, be acknowledged as an advisory member of this synodical assembly. The committee to examine the protocol of the German Reformed General Synod reported that they examined said protocol, and found the following items which may require to be considered at this meeting: 1. That Messrs. Schaeffer and Kurtz, appointed as our delegates to the Reformed Synod at our last year's meeting, were received as advisory members by the Reformed Synod. Resolved, That this Synod sees in this action evidence of the love of those whom we acknowledge as brethren, and that it is prepared always, as heretofore, to reciprocate this kindness. 2. That Revs. Hoffman and Rahausen were appointed delegates by the Reformed Synod to attend our present synodical meeting. Resolved, That Pastors Muhlenberg and Knoske attend the next meeting of the Reformed Synod at Reading as delegates from this Synod." (6. 16 f.) In 1820 the Pennsylvania Synod en-

tered upon its wild scheme to found a seminary at Frederick, Md., with Dr. Milledoller as professor, with \$2,000 salary. This stopped all other negotiations for the time being. Dr. Milledoller held the call under consideration two years, and then declined. He went to New Brunswick immediately after that, and Col. Rutger's money went with him to that place, which, it was understood, would go to whatever place Dr. Milledoller would go. (*Lutheran Observer*, Sept., 1881.) The fact that nothing tangible resulted from the movement of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed synods and of establishing a union seminary was not due in the least to a growing confessionalism on the part of the Pennsylvania Synod, for at that time such was not in evidence anywhere.

#### TYPICAL REPRESENTATIVES OF SYNOD.

**64. C. F. L. Endress Denounces Form of Concord.** — Among the better class of Lutherans prominent in the Pennsylvania Synod during the decades immediately preceding and following the year 1800 were such men as J. B. Schmucker, H. A. Muhlenberg, Lochman, Probst, and Endress. In the Proceedings of the General Synod, 1827, Lochman and Endress are spoken of as belonging to "the Fathers of our General Synod, and able ministers of the Lord Jesus," as the "oldest and most respected members" of the Synod of East Pennsylvania, as "men who were among the brightest ornaments of the Lutheran Church, and whose departure is lamented no less by the synods in general than by that to which they more immediately belonged." (12.21.) Yet they, too, were absolutely indifferent as to the Lutheran Symbols. Dr. C. F. Endress, a pupil of Helmuth, a leading spirit in the Pennsylvania Ministerium and most prominent in the unionistic transactions with the German Reformed Church, declared his theological position as follows: "We have the Formula Concordiae, in which expulsion, condemnation, anathema, were, in the most liberal manner, pronounced and poured forth against all those who were of a different opinion, which, however, thank God, was never received universally by the Lutheran Church. I would suffer both my hands to be burned off before I would subscribe that instrument." "As we have hitherto received the Augsburg Confession

and Luther's Catechism and Melanchthon's Apology, so I have no objection that they should be kept in reverence and respect as our peculiar documents, but not to overrule the Bible. For by this shall the Lutheran Church forever distinguish itself from all other religious connections, that the Bible, the Bible alone, shall remain the only sun in Christ Jesus, and that we rest upon human declarations of faith only in so far as they receive their light more or less from that great light." "What shall I answer on the question, What is the confession of faith of the Lutheran Church? Answer: I will not dictate to you what you should say; but if I should be asked, I would say, first, and principally, and solely, and alone: The Holy Word of God contained in the writings of the prophets and apostles. The confessions of faith by the Church of the first four centuries we hold in conformity with the Bible, and receive them, as far as I know, universally in the Lutheran Church. The confession of the princes of the German Empire presented at the Diet of Augsburg is held by all in honor and respect, and when we compare it with other human confessions, we give it a decided preference. Luther's Catechism is used in all Lutheran churches, and no catechism of other religious denominations has that honor. The so-called Apology is in possession of very few Lutheran ministers; but whether they have read it or not, they consider it a good book. The Smalcald Articles I have often read. In Germany they are taken up among the Symbols. I know not whether any other divine in the Lutheran Church in America ever read it except Muhlenberg and Lochman. In short, we hold firmly and steadfastly to our beloved Bible, when the one holds to Calvin, the other to Zwingli, a third to the Heidelberg Catechism, a fourth to the Confession of the Synod of Dort, a fifth to the Westminster Catechism, a sixth to the Common-prayer Book, a seventh to the Solemn League and Covenant, and the eighth to the darkened and depraved reason *per se*, the ninth to reason under the name of Holy Spirit, and the tenth to the devil himself in the form of an angel of light. But I will cleave to my beloved Bible, and hereby it shall remain. Amen." (*Luth. Observer*, Sept., 1881.)

**65. Rev. Probst Defending Union.** — The *Lutheran Observer*, September, 1881, from whose columns we quoted

the statements above concerning Dr. Endress, continues: Rev. Probst, who was a member of the Pennsylvania Synod from 1813 until his death, and well acquainted with the sentiments of his brethren, in a work published in 1826 for the express purpose of promoting a formal and complete union of the German Reformed and Lutheran churches in America, entitled, *Reunion of the Lutherans and Reformed*, says that there was no material difference of doctrinal views between them, the Lutherans having relinquished the bodily presence, and the Reformed unconditional election. Speaking of the supposed obstacles to such union, he remarks: "The doctrine of unconditional election cannot be in the way. This doctrine has long since been abandoned; for there can scarcely be a single German Reformed preacher found who regards it as his duty to defend this doctrine. Zwingli's more liberal, rational, and Scriptural view of this doctrine, as well as of the Lord's Supper, has become the prevailing one among Lutherans and Reformed, and it has been deemed proper to abandon the view of both Luther and Calvin on the subject of both these doctrines." (74.) "The whole mass of the old Confessions, occasioned by the peculiar circumstances of those troublous times, has become obsolete by the lapse of ages, and is yet valuable only as matter of history. Those times and circumstances have passed away, and our situation, both in regard to political and ecclesiastical relations, is entirely changed. We are therefore not bound to these books, but only to the Bible. For what do the unlearned know of the Augsburg Confession, or the Form of Concord, or the Synod of Dort?" (76.) "Both churches [the Lutheran and the Reformed] advocate the evangelical liberty of judging for themselves, and have one and the same ground of their faith — the Bible. Accordingly, both regard the Gospel as their exclusive rule of faith and practise, and are forever opposed to all violations of the liberty of conscience." (76.) "All enlightened and intelligent preachers of both churches agree that there is much in the former Symbolical Books that must be stricken out as antiquated and contrary to common sense, and be made conformable with the Bible, and that we have no right to pledge ourselves to the mere human opinions of Luther, or Calvin, or Zwingli, and that we have but one Master, Christ. Nor is any evangelical Christian bound to the

interpretations which Luther, or Calvin, or any other person may place on the words of Christ; but each one has the right to interpret them according to the dictates of his own conscience." (80.) "Inasmuch as all educated ministers of the Lutheran and Reformed churches now entertain more reasonable and more Scriptural views on those doctrines which were formerly the subjects of controversy, what necessity is there of a continued separation?" (81.)

#### **SYNOD'S UN-LUTHERAN ATTITUDE CONTINUED.**

66. **Decades of Indifferentism.** — After the abortive efforts at establishing a union seminary and uniting with the Reformed organically, and after her withdrawal from the General Synod in 1823, the Pennsylvania Synod passed through a long period of indifferentism before the spirit of Lutheran confessionalism once more began to manifest itself, chiefly in consequence of influences from German Lutheran immigrants and by the activity of such men as Drs. Krauth and Mann. However, even till the middle of the nineteenth century the symptoms of reviving Lutheranism in the Pennsylvania Synod were but relatively weak, few, and far between. The Agenda of 1842 still contained the union formula of distribution in the Lord's Supper and revealed a unionistic and Reformed spirit everywhere. A form of Baptism savors of Pelagianism and Rationalism. The Agenda does not contain a single clear and unequivocal confession of the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence. The second form for celebrating the Lord's Supper states: "As we are sensual creatures, He [Christ] has appointed two external, visible elements, bread and wine, as tokens (Pfaender), as it were, in order by them to assure us that with, in, and under them (mit, bei und unter denselben) we should become partakers of His body and blood, that is, of His entire grace of atonement. As surely, therefore, as a penitent communicant receives the blessed bread and the blessed cup, so surely he, in a manner invisible, will also receive from his Savior a share in His body and blood." (*Lutheraner* 1844, 47; 1846, 61. 81.) In 1848 Rev. Weyl, of Baltimore, the arch-enemy of confessional Lutheranism and unscrupulous slanderer of Wyneken, Reynolds, etc., declared in his church-paper

that within the whole Synod of Pennsylvania there were hardly ten preachers who, in their faith and teaching regarding the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, deviated from the views of the General Synod. Dr. Walther remarked with respect to this statement, which he was inclined to regard as mendacious: "Since the [Pennsylvania] Synod was not ashamed to conclude its Centennial Jubilee by declaring this miserable paper [of Weyl] its organ and thereby publishing to the world its spiritual death [as a Lutheran Church], it serves her right to have this man write her epitaph." (L. 1848, 31.) Concerning the new hymn-book of the Pennsylvania Synod, Rev. Hoyer wrote in *Kirchliche Mitteilungen*: "After a closer inspection I found that this hymn-book was compiled for three classes of people, Orthodox, Unionists, and Supranaturalists. Here we find, besides 'Es ist das Heil uns kommen her,' also 'Religion, von Gott gegeben,' as well as a hymn for the national holiday, the 4th of July, imploring the Lord to give us the spirit of Washington." (1850, 91; L. 7, 55.) *Der Lutherische Herold*, which, edited by H. Ludwig, appeared since April, 1851, in New York, represented the class of German Lutherans within the Ministeriums of Pennsylvania and New York then most advanced in their protestations of Lutheranism. But what kind of Lutheranism it was that Ludwig and his paper advocated appears from the following quotation: "We expect little sympathy from the Old Lutherans; yet, our endeavor shall always be to banish from our columns everything that might increase the breach, *for in doctrine we are one, we only differ in the form of the dress*, that is to say, in practise, and in the mode and manner of spreading the doctrine." (L. 7, 151; 8, 143.) In January, 1855, the same paper was complimented by the *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung* as follows: "The *Lutherische Herold*, published by H. Ludwig, endeavors to mediate between the two extremes in the Lutheran Church of this country, and represents the milder Melanchthonian conception of the Sacraments. We read the *Herold* with joy, and wish it a recognition and encouragement commensurate with its services." (L. 11, 102.) As late as 1851 the Pennsylvania Synod, according to the report of the convention in that year, 51 ministers being present, maintained fraternal intercourse with the Reformed, United, Methodists, and Moravians. She admitted Reformed and Presbyterian

preachers as advisory members. Synod had also received a Reformed minister as such into her ministerium. She assembled in Reformed and Presbyterian churches for union services, and attended the service in a Methodist church. She also adopted the resolution to enter into more intimate relations with the Moravians. (*L.* 1852, 138.) In the following year Synod returned to its original confessional position in the days of Muhlenberg, though in a somewhat equivocal manner. (Spaeth, *W. J. Mann*, 171.) In 1853, however, at the same time appealing to all Lutheran synods to follow her example, the Pennsylvania Synod resolved, by a vote of 54 to 28, to reunite with the General Synod, then rapidly approaching its lowest water-mark, doctrinally and confessionally, its leading men openly and uninterruptedly denouncing the doctrines distinctive of Lutheranism and zealously preparing the way for the Definite Platform as a substitute for the Augsburg Confession. Indeed, the Pennsylvania Synod added to its resolution on the reunion that, "should the General Synod violate its constitution, and require of our Synod assent to anything conflicting with the old and long-established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, then our delegates are hereby required to protest against such action, to withdraw from its sessions, and to report to this body." (Penn. Minutes 1853, 18.) However, the action as such was tantamount to a violation and denial of the Lutheran Confession. Dr. Walther remarked with respect to the union: "This event will be hailed by many with great joy, a joy, however, that we are unable to share in in any measure. . . . For who does not see that the Synod [of Pennsylvania], by entering into ecclesiastical union with a body notoriously heterodox, has already departed from, and actually denied, the good Confession of our Church?" (*L.* 9, 122.) Confirming the correctness of this statement, the Pennsylvania Synod, thirteen years later, when the ranks of her conservatives had materially increased, severed her connection with the General Synod.

**67. Dr. Sihler's Estimate.** — In 1858 Dr. Sihler wrote concerning the Pennsylvania Synod: "When the writer of this article, more than fourteen years ago, came to this country and gradually informed himself on the American conditions of

the Lutheran Church, he had to observe with heartfelt sorrow that the Pennsylvania Synod, then still undivided and very numerous, in whose territory or vicinity the leaders of the so-called Lutheran General Synod have their field of labor was so completely indifferent toward the shameful apostasy of the latter from the faith and the Confession of the Lutheran Church. For in vain one looked for a strong and decided testimony in any of the synodical reports of this church-body against the pseudo-Lutherans of the General Synod. Nor was there to be found within the Pennsylvania Synod, or in other synods not belonging to the General Synod, so much earnest zeal and love for the truth of God's Word and of the Confessions of the Church, nor did it have any men among its theologians who were able to expose thoroughly in the English language the error, the hollowness and shallowness of the miserable productions of a Schmucker and Kurtz, who were made Doctors of Theology by God in His wrath and by Satan as a joke and for the purpose of ridicule. On the contrary, they seemed to be not a little impressed with the theological learning and dogmatical science of these two so-called Doctors, who, in rare self-satisfaction, found life and complete happiness in Reinhard's supernaturalism. In short, these open counterfeiters, Calvinists, Methodists, and Unionists, these base traitors and destroyers of the Lutheran Church, were and always remained the dear brethren, who contributed not a little to the prosperity and welfare of the dear 'Lutheran Zion.' Accordingly, it did not require a gift of prophecy when the writer of this article, as early as 1844, foretold in the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* [edited by Schmidt in Pittsburgh] that, indifferently observing, as they did, the anticonfessional, church-destroying activities of the so-called General Synod, yea, fraternizing with their leaders, they would become their prey, as was actually the case several years ago." (*Lehre u. Wehre* 1858, 137.)

### LUTHERANS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

**68. Pioneer Pastors in South Carolina.** — In 1735 colonists from Germany and Switzerland had settled in Orangeburg Co., S. C. Their first resident pastor was J. U. Giessen-danner, who arrived in 1737 with new emigrants, but died the

following year. He was succeeded by his son, who was ordained first by the Presbyterians and then by the Bishop of London, in 1849. Orangeburg was thus lost to the Lutheran Church. At Charleston, S. C., Bolzius conducted the first Lutheran services and administered the Lord's Supper in 1734. Muhlenberg preached there in 1742. The first pastor who, in 1755, organized the Lutherans at Charleston into a congregation (St. John's) was J. G. Friedrichs (Friederichs). In 1759 he was succeeded by H. B. G. Wordman (Wartmann), who had labored in Pennsylvania. In 1763 Wordman was succeeded by J. N. Martin. He dedicated the church begun in 1759. J. S. Hahnbaum, who came from Germany with his family in 1767, was, according to the church records, forbidden to "be addicted to the English Articles" and to attack the Church of England. The gown, wafers, festivals, gospels and epistles, and the use of the litany on Sunday afternoons, are required. (Jacobs, 297.) Hahnbaum died in 1770. His successor, who also married his daughter, was Magister F. Daser. He had arrived in Charleston, sold as a redemptioner, and had been redeemed by one of the elders of the Lutheran congregation. (G., 574.) In 1774 H. M. Muhlenberg advised the congregation and adjusted some of her difficulties. In the same year Martin returned and served till 1778, when he was succeeded by Christian Streit, who labored until he was driven away in the vicissitudes of the Revolutionary War, there being a tradition of his arrest by the British in 1780. (Jacobs, 297.) Pastor Martin served a third term in Charleston from 1786 to 1787, when he was succeeded by J. C. Faber, who wrote to Germany, from where he had arrived in 1787: His congregation was growing; it was a model of Christian unity; it consisted of Lutherans, German Reformed, and Catholics; they all lived together most peacefully, attending the same services and sharing in the support of their pastor, who had brought about such a union. No wonder that the congregation was satisfied with the service of the Episcopalian Pogson when Faber had resigned on account of ill health. (G., 582 f.)

**69. "Unio Ecclesiastica" in South Carolina.** — In 1788 fifteen German congregations were incorporated in the State of South Carolina, nine of them being Lutheran and six Re-

formed or United. The Lutheran congregations were served by F. Daser, J. G. Bamberg, F. A. Wallberg, F. J. Wallern, and C. Binnicher; the rest, by the Reformed Pastors Theus and Froelich. In 1787 these ministers and congregations had united as a "corpus evangelicum" under the following title: "Unio Ecclesiastica of the German Protestant Churches in the State of South Carolina." Pastor Daser was chosen *Senior Ministerii*. At the following convention, January 8, 1788, all Lutheran ministers present pledged themselves on the Symbolical Books. A third meeting was held August 12, 1788; President Daser presented a constitution, which was adopted. Among other things it provided: 1. The intention of this union was not that any member should deny his own confession. 2. A Directorium, composed of the ministers and two laymen, should remain in power as long as a majority of the 15 congregations would be in favor of it. 3. The Directorium should be entrusted with all church affairs: the admission, dismissal, election, examination, ordination, and induction of ministers; the establishment of new churches and schools; the order of divine service, collections, etc. 4. Any member of any of the congregations was bound to appear before the Directorium when cited by this body. 5. Where the majority of a congregation was Reformed, a Reformed Agenda and Catechism were to be used. 6. The ministers should be faithful in the discharge of their pastoral duties, . . . visiting the schools frequently, admonishing the parents to give their children a Christian training, etc. 7. A copy of this constitution should be deposited in every congregation and subscribed by its members. 8. Complaints against the pastor which the vestry failed to settle should be reported to the President immediately. 9. The brethren in Europe should be petitioned to provide the congregations with preachers and schoolteachers.—It is self-evident that this anomalous union with a Directorium invested with governing and judicial powers, to whose decisions Lutheran as well as Reformed pastors and congregations had to submit, lacked vitality, and, apart from flagrant denials of the truth, was bound to lead to destructive frictions. After an existence of several years the "Unio Ecclesiastica" died a natural death, the Directorium, as far as has been traced, holding its last meeting in 1794. By 1804, the ministers who had organized

this union body, all save one, were dead. The congregations eked out a miserable existence, becoming, in part, a prey to the Methodists and Baptists. Thus also the promising Lutheran field of South Carolina was finally turned into a desert, chiefly in consequence of the dearth of Lutheran preachers, who really could have been produced from this very field. (G., 601 ff.)

### THE NORTH CAROLINA SYNOD.

**70. Unionistic from the Beginning.** — Most of the Germans in North Carolina came from Pennsylvania. In 1771 the congregation at Salisbury (which was in existence as early as 1768, and soon thereafter erected a church), together with the congregations in Rowan Co. and in Mecklenburg Co., sent a delegation to England, Holland, and Germany, asking for assistance. The result was that Pastor A. Ruessmann, who died in 1794, and Teacher J. G. Arends (Ahrends), who soon officiated as pastor, were sent in 1773. In 1787 Pastor Chr. E. Bernhardt arrived, followed by C. A. G. Stork (Storch) in 1788, and A. Roschen, who returned to Germany in 1800. But it was not genuine Lutheranism which was cultivated by these German emissaries. Many of the books coming from Helmstedt were of a rationalistic character. Also the North Carolina Catechism ("Nordkarolingischer Katechismus . . ., entworfen von Johann Kaspar Velthusen, Doktor und ordentlichem Lehrer der Theologie, erstem Prediger in Helmstedt und Generalsuperintendent") savored of rationalism. The confessional and doctrinal degeneration of the pastors in North Carolina appears from, and is attested by, the fact that in his ordination, in 1794, R. J. Miller was pledged to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopalians. The Synod of North Carolina experienced a rapid growth, receiving 19 congregations into membership in 1813. According to the Report of 1815, twenty lay delegates were present at the meeting of that year. In 1823, after the separation of the Tennessee Synod, the North Carolina Synod reported 19 ministers with about 1,360 communicants. Its first convention had been held in Salisbury, May 2, 1803. Besides the lay delegates, this meeting was attended by Pastor Arends, Miller, Stork, and Paul Henkel. From the very beginning the Articles of Synod made no men-

tion of the Lutheran Confessions. At the meeting of 1804 a Reformed minister delivered the sermon. In 1810 a resolution was passed permitting every pastor to administer communion to those of another faith. It was furthermore resolved: "Whereas it is evident that awakenings occur in our day by means of preaching for three consecutive days, and whereas this is to be desired among our brethren in the faith, it was resolved, on motion of Mr. Philip Henkel, to make a trial in all our churches next spring." In the same year the North Carolina Synod ordered the ordination of the Moravian G. Shober (Schober). The minutes of 1815 record the following: "Since the church council of a newly built Reformed church in Guilford County expressly desires that our next synod be held in their church, it was resolved that synod shall be held in said church on the third Sunday in October, 1816." As in the other Lutheran bodies of that time, pulpit- and altar-fellowship, Reformed teaching, and Methodistic enthusiasm became increasingly rampant in Synod. In 1817 Synod declared that it would continue to bear the Lutheran name, and became demonstrative over the Reformation tercentenary. The same convention, however, passed a resolution with regard to the joint hymn-book published by Schaeffer and Maund in Baltimore, as follows: "We hereby tender the aforementioned gentlemen our heartiest thanks, and rejoice that we are able to accede fully to the aforementioned recommendations for its use both at church and in private among all our congregations. At the same time we humbly petition the God of love and unity to crown it with blessings in His kingdom and temple. It was also resolved that the English Agenda which Quitman had introduced in New York "be adopted as one of our symbolical books, and as such be recommended for use." (G., 647.).

**71. Shober's Jubilee Book.** — In 1817 Synod also approved of, and resolved to publish, Shober's jubilee book, "A Comprehensive Account of the Rise and Progress of the Blessed Reformation of the Christian Church by Doctor Martin Luther, begun on the thirty-first of October, A. D. 1517; interspersed with views of his character and doctrine, extracted from his book; and how the Church established by him arrived and progressed in North America, as also the Constitution and

Rules of that Church, in North Carolina and adjoining States, as existing in October, 1817." In the Preface, Shober gives utterance to the hope that all Protestant churches and their individual members would, by reading his book, be moved "to pray to God that He would awaken the spirit of love and union in all who believe in the deity of Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and men, in order to attain the happy time prophesied, when we shall blissfully live as one flock under one Shepherd." On page 208 ff. he says: "Why are we not all united in love and union? Why these distances, controversies, disputes, mutual condemnations, why these splittings of formulas? Why cannot the Church of Christ be one flock under one Shepherd? My friends, at the proper time the Lord will unite us all. Thank God, we see the morning star rising; the Union approaches, in Europe through Bible-societies, in America, too, through mission-societies, through the efforts of the rich and poor in sending out religious tracts, through the hundred thousand children who now learn to know their God and Savior in the Sunday-schools. Through frequent revivals and many other signs it becomes apparent that the earth will soon be filled with the knowledge of the Lord. Among all classes of those who adore Jesus as God I see nothing of importance which could prevent a cordial union; and what a fortunate event would it be if all churches would unite and send delegates to a general convention of all denominations and there could settle down on Christ, the Rock, while at the same time each denomination would be permitted to retain its peculiar ways and forms. This would have the influence on all Christians that, wherever and whenever they met each other, they would love one another and keep fellowship with each other." Synod declared: This book "will give to our fellow-Christians in other denominations a clear view of what the Lutheran Church really is." Yet, in this jubilee-gift Shober practically denied the Lutheran doctrines of the Lord's Supper and of Absolution, and, as shown, enthusiastically advocated a universal union of all Christian denominations. Previously Shober had written: "I have carefully examined the doctrine of the Episcopal Church, have read many excellent writers of the Presbyterians, know the doctrine of the Methodists from

their book *Portraiture of Methodism*, and am acquainted with the doctrine of the Baptists, as far as they receive and adore Jesus the Savior. Among all classes of those who adore Jesus as God, I find nothing of importance which could prevent a cordial union." (647 f. 682.)

### CRITICAL CONVENTIONS.

72. "Untimely Synod" of 1819. — The leaders of the North Carolina Synod, Stork, Shober, Jacob Scherer, Daniel Scherer, Miller, and others, cherished a sanguine hope of uniting all churches into a national American Church, despite doctrinal differences. What could be more delightful, and what in all the world could be more desired, they declared in 1820, than "to bring about a general union of all religious parties throughout the entire land, that the glorious prophecy might be fulfilled: that they might all be one flock who are all under one Shepherd." (*Tennessee Report* 1820, 25.) The scheme also of organizing a Lutheran General Synod (for which purpose the Pennsylvania Synod had invited all other Lutheran bodies to attend its meetings at Baltimore in 1819 in order to discuss plans for this projected Pan-Lutheran union) was exultantly hailed as a step in this direction by the leaders of the North Carolina Synod, notably by Shober. Accordingly, in order to enable the North Carolina Synod to take part in the meeting at Baltimore, the officers of Synod autocratically convened that body five weeks before the time fixed by the constitution. Shober was sent to Baltimore as delegate, and took a prominent part in drawing up the "Planentwurf," the tentative constitution for the organization of a General Synod. This irregular meeting of the North Carolina Synod was later on known as the "Untimely Synod." It provoked much ill feeling and led to the organization of the Tennessee Synod in 1820. (*Tenn. Rep.* 1820, 49.) At this "Untimely Synod" David Henkel was charged with teaching transubstantiation, because he had preached the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to his congregations. Synod found him guilty, and degraded him to the rank of catechist for a period of six months. Says the Report of the Tennessee Synod, 1820: "David Henkel was to be entitled to his former rank in office only when, after a period

of six months, sufficient written evidence should have been submitted to the President that peace obtained in his congregations, and that no important accusation was lodged against him by others, especially by the Reformed [Presbyterians], whereupon the President would be empowered to confer on him the privileges of a candidate until the next synod." (18.) The following statement of the same Report characterizes the doctrinal attitude of President Stork and other leaders of Synod: "We [the Henkels] have written evidence that, when a paper was read at said 'Untimely Synod' containing the statement that the human nature of Jesus Christ had been received into the divine nature (dass die Menschheit Jesu Christi in die Gotttheit sei aufgenommen worden), and that therefore He possessed all the divine attributes, the President [Stork] declared that he could not believe this. And when it was said that such was the teaching of the Bible, he answered: 'Even if five hundred Bibles should say so, he would not believe it!' And to our knowledge he was never called to account for this statement." (20.) The autocratic actions of the leaders of the North Carolina Synod and their adherents virtually resulted in a rupture of Synod in the same year. For the dissatisfied party held a synod of their own at Buffalo Creek, at the time specified by the constitution, and ordained Bell and David Henkel.

**73. "Synod of Strife" (Streitsynode).** — The meeting at Lincolnton, N. C., 1820, which followed the "Untimely Synod," was marked by painful scenes and altercations and the final breach between the majority, who were resolved to unite with the General Synod, and the minority, who opposed the union and accused the leader not only of high-handed, autocratic procedure and usurpation of power in contravention of the constitution, but also of false doctrine, and publicly refused to recognize them as Lutherans. On Sunday, May 28, Synod was opened with a service in which Stork preached German and Bell English. Monday morning the preachers, delegates, and a great multitude of people from the neighborhood returned to the church. They found it occupied by Pastors Paul Henkel, Philip Henkel, David Henkel, and Bell, who refused admission to the rest. After some parliamenteering, written and verbal,

both parties entered the church. The Henkels report as follows: "They [the opponents] took their stand on the fact that the majority was on their side and according to it everything should be decided. Accordingly, before they came to us in the church, they first delegated one of their preachers with two questions directed to one of our preachers. The first was: 'Whether he intended to separate from the North Carolina Synod?' The second: 'Whether he was willing to be governed by a majority of preachers and delegates in the matters disputed?' He, giving him no decisive answer, came to the rest of us and told us. We answered in writing: 'That we neither intend to separate ourselves from Synod, nor would suffer ourselves to be governed by a majority; but that we wanted everything investigated and decided according to the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession and according to the constitution or order of our church, nothing else.' In the mean time the minister delegated came to us where we were gathered and demanded a verbal answer to the same questions. We then gave this answer also verbally, whereupon he said with an arrogant gesture and autoeratic tone: 'That is not the point; I only ask, Do you want to, or do you not want to?' We answered: 'We did not want to.' He declared, 'That is all I desire to know'; and saying which he rapidly turned about and hastily ran away from us. In the mean time the multitude of our opponents moved toward us, proposing the same questions. We answered as before. The leaders among them endeavored to maintain that, in order to decide the dispute, we were not bound to the constitution, but only to the majority of the votes of the preachers and delegates, which majority they had; and that it was reasonable and fair for us to act according to it in this dispute. But we thought that the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession (being assured, as we were, that it can be proved by the doctrine of the Bible) should be of a greater weight to us than the voice of a majority of men who are opposed to the doctrine and order of our Church. After a brief altercation of this kind they went into the church, and we followed. Here the President [Stork], in a long speech in German, endeavored to prove what he had asserted before. The Secretary [Shober] made a still longer speech in English, in

which he endeavored to prove that we were not at all bound to act according to the constitution or order of our Church; although he himself, with the approval of Synod, had written the constitution and had it printed, this was not done with the intention of making it a rule or norm by which we, as members of Synod, were to be guided in our transactions; it was merely a sort of draft or model according to which, in course of time, one might formulate a good constitution, if in the future such should become necessary. However, it was proved [by the Henkels] from the constitution itself that it had been received as just such an [official] document, sanctioned, after previous examination and approval by several ministers, by Synod and ordered to be printed. To this he [Shober] answered that such had not been the intention of Synod. Haste and lack of time had caused him to write it thus without previous careful consideration; therefore, now everything had to be governed and judged according to the majority. But we were of the opinion that it would prove to be a very unreasonable action to reject a constitution which a few years ago, according to a resolution of Synod, had been printed and bound in 1,500 copies, the money being taken from the synodical treasury, and sold at 75 cts. a copy." (*Tenn. Rep.* 1820, 24.) The question concerning the violation of the constitution would, no doubt, have been settled in favor of the Henkels, if they had not opposed the leaders in their union schemes and charged them with false doctrine and apostasy from the Lutheran Church. Says the aforementioned Tennessee Report: "Even though the officers with their adherents (die alten Herrn Beamten mit ihrem Zugehör) could perhaps themselves have thought so far [as to realize the arbitrariness of their procedure with reference to the 'Untimely Synod'], yet the desire to organize the General Synod and to bring about a union with all religious bodies, especially with the Presbyterians, was so strong as to outweigh everything else" [even an imminent breach]. The leaders finally admitted that both parties had erred, and declared their willingness to pardon everything if the minority would reunite with them. The Henkels, however, declared that they could have no fellowship with people who were addicted to false doctrines concerning

Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and rejected the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession. They also declared their impatience with the contemplated "general union of all religious denominations," saying that such a union was no more possible than to bring together as one peaceful flock into one fold "sheep, goats, lambs, cows, oxen, horses, bears, wolves, wild cats, foxes, and swine." At this juncture one of the officers, dissolving the meeting and leaving the church, exclaimed: "Whoever is a *true Lutheran*, may he come with us to the hotel of J. H.; there we will begin our Synod!" The minority answered: "Whoever wants to be a true fanatic (Schwaermer), may he go along; for you are no real Lutheran preachers: you are fanatics (Schwaermer) and to them you belong!" A young teacher added: "According to the testimony of Holy Scripture, it is impossible for us to regard you as anything but false teachers." Then one of the old ministers, turning toward the assembly, said: "Now you yourselves have heard the boldness and impertinence of this young man, who charges us, old and respectable ministers that we are, with false doctrine." Similar utterances were made by others. The report concludes: "However, they left the church without defending themselves against such accusations, except that one of the old ministers said at the exit of the church that he was much astonished. But we could not help that." (*Tenn. Report* 1820, 27.) As Bell joined the Shober party, his ordination at Buffalo Creek was declared constitutional and ratified as valid. Shober now reported on his cordial reception by the Pennsylvania Synod and on the transaction which led to the adoption of the "Planentwurf" for the contemplated organization of the General Synod. The document, after its individual paragraphs had been read and discussed, was adopted by the North Carolina Synod by a majority of 15 to 6—a result which Shober had forestalled in a letter to the Pennsylvania Synod assembled at Lancaster, stating "that the greatest part of the members of the North Carolina Synod had adopted the so-called Planentwurf," and expressing the hope that the General Synod might be established. After adopting the "Planentwurf," the North Carolina Synod elected Pastors Shober and Peter Schmucker delegates to the convention of the General Synod, which was to convene

at Hagerstown, Md., October 22, 1820. Only a few ministers from Tennessee being present, the Henkels resolved not to transact any business at this time. (27.)

**74. Doctrinal Dispute at Lincolnton.** — The points disputed at Lincolnton did not only refer to the autocratic actions of the leaders of the Synod and their union schemes, but also to the doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, regarding which the minority charged Stork, Shober, and their followers with holding un-Lutheran and anticonfessional views. The discussions on these doctrines caused James Hill, a Methodist preacher who was present, to address a letter to Synod in which he said: "For almost thirteen years which I have spent in this county [Lincoln Co., N. C., where David Henkel preached], I have understood that the greatest number of your preachers in the county have taught that the baptism of water effects regeneration, and that the body and blood of Christ is received bodily with the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, so that these doctrines, being so generally taught and confessedly believed, confirmed me in the conviction that they are the orthodox doctrines of the Lutheran Church. Last Monday [at the discussion on floor of Synod], however, I discovered, or believed to discover, that some members of your Rev. Synod entertained different views. . . . Now, in order that I may know how to conduct myself in the future toward so respectable a part of the Church of Christ [North Carolina Synod], I request the opinion of your Synod on the above points." The answer, formulated by R. J. Miller and Peter Schmucker, and approved of by the ministerium, was: "We do not say that all who are baptized with water are regenerated and converted to God, so that they are saved without the operation of the Holy Spirit, or in other words, without faith in Christ." "We do not believe and teach that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are bodily received with the bread and wine in the Holy Supper, but that the true believer receives and enjoys it spiritually together with all saving gifts of His suffering and death, by faith in Jesus Christ." (681.) According to the report of the Henkels, the doctrine of predestination as taught by the Presbyterians was also touched upon, for in it we read: "One of the members declared, and sought to maintain, that it was

impossible for a man to fall from the grace of God after he had once been truly converted. Another denied the doctrine of Baptism as laid down in our catechism and in the Second and Ninth Articles of the Augsburg Confession. The offer was made to a third to prove to him from his own handwriting that he denied the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as set forth in the Tenth Article [of the Augsburg Confession]. They offered to have the letter read; but our opponents did not agree to this. A book was placed before him and a passage was pointed out to him, in order that he might read what Luther, of blessed memory, himself teaches on this question. He closed it angrily and pushed it away. A fourth put the question: 'Can I not be a [Presbyterian] predestinarian and also a Lutheran?' For he believed that the [Presbyterian] doctrine of predestination could be proven from the Bible. He received the answer: 'If he believed as the Predestinarians believe, then he belonged to them, and might go to them, it did not concern us.'—For these reasons we believed to be all the more certain that they were not true Evangelical Lutheran preachers, and this we also told them without reservation." (*Tenn. Rep.* 1820, 24 f.) In connection with the doctrine of regeneration by Baptism, the Henkels also referred to the error of the enthusiasts, gaining ground increasingly within the North Carolina Synod, *viz.*, that conversion and regeneration was effected by anxious shrieking, united praying, and the exertion of all powers of the body and soul. (32 f.) The rupture, then, was inevitable: the doctrinal and spiritual gap between Shober and his compeers on the one hand and the Henkels and their adherents on the other hand being just as wide and insurmountable as that between Zwingli and Luther at Marburg 1529. The leaders of the North Carolina Synod were not only unionistic, but, in more than one respect, Reformed theologians. The ministers who soon after united in organizing the Tennessee Synod declared with respect to the North Carolina Synod: "If they would adopt the name of what we believe they really are, and in this way withdraw from us, then we and other people would know what our relation was toward them. But if they intend to remain in our household, they shall also submit to its authority [Augsburg Confession], or we will have nothing to do with them." (31.)

**GOTTLIEB SHOBER.**

**75. Harbors Reformed Views on Lord's Supper.** — The charges against David Henkel as to his teaching the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, referred to above, had been lodged with Pastor Shober, then secretary of the North Carolina Synod. When David Henkel complained that his accusers were not named, Shober, who had never forsaken his Moravian views, wrote him a letter, dated October 20, 1818, which at the same time reveals that, as to the Lord's Supper, his were the views of the Reformed. For here we read: "Your very long epistle, proving that Christ is with His body everywhere present, is excellent on paper, but not so in the pulpit, where seven-eighths of the hearers will gaze at the profound erudition and one-eighth of such as reason will shake heads at a thing to be believed, but not explainable, and to none will it effect conviction of the necessity of spiritual regeneration and of adopting Him as their God and Savior crucified." "I must assure you that creditable people of our Church and the Reformed have not only heard you advance that whosoever is baptized and partakes of the Supper wants no other and further repentance, but also that whosoever teaches other doctrine, he is a false teacher. This, my dear sir, is making people secure in forms and not in realities. How easy is it to go to heaven, for an adulterous heart to be absolved by Mr. Henkel, and as a seal to receive from Mr. Henkel the Sacrament, who by his few words made bread body and wine blood — and such a holy divine body, without limitation of space, as is compelled to enter into all substances and beings, whether they will or not, so that a Belial, when he receives it, must thereby be made an heir of heaven. No, no, I cannot believe in such theories, and as I told you once at my home when you returned from Virginia and asked me on that subject, so I think yet, and say that when Mr. Henkel consecrates bread and wine, it is the body and blood of our Savior to such with whom He can unite; but to those who are not of pure heart and yet partake, and that with reverence, the spirituality of the true essence does not unite with their souls; they eat bread and wine, for they have not such a faith, love, and humility as enables them to possess the divine essence. And those that partake without reverence,

light-minded, and during the ceremony disdain the simplicity of the institution, mock and deride it, they bring judgment upon themselves for eating and drinking the consecrated elements, but not for partaking [the] body and blood of Jesus, for they have not partaken thereof. God and Belial cannot unite. Do, pray, reflect deeply on the subject, and assure to all peace in heart, and those of contrite spirit that the Lord in the Sacrament will unite with them spiritually and seal their heavenly inheritance. But invite them all to come and partake that revere the Savior as God, and assure them that, if they approach with reverence, it may be made the means of viewing the condescending love of God ready to unite with them, and their own depravity, which will or may make them cry, and, if pure in heart, obtain mercy."

**76. Slanderizing David Henkel.** — What the Henkels, as early as 1809, had taught on the Lord's Supper, appears from a pamphlet published in that year at New Market, in the printery of Henkel. Here we read as follows: "But Paul teaches us that the bread which we break in the Lord's Supper is the communion of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing with which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ. If our bread and wine has communion with the body and blood of Christ, then it also must be what our dear Lord Himself calls it in the institution: His body and His blood." (680.) This genuinely Lutheran doctrine it was that also David Henkel had been preaching, and which his opponents who charged him with Roman aberrations called transubstantiation, impanation, or consubstantiation. And true to his Reformed traditions, Shober continued in his endeavors to slander David Henkel as a Crypto-Papist. This compelled Henkel to make the following explanation in 1827: "The ministry of the North Carolina Synod are charged with denying the most important doctrine of the Lutheran Church, and have been requested to come to a reciprocal trial, which they have obstinately refused. . . . Those ministers, as it plainly appears, entertain a strong personal prejudice against me, and have asserted many charges with respect to my personal conduct, as well as with respect to my doctrines. What shall I say? Have I not heretofore offered them a reciprocal trial, even as it respects personal conduct? Why did they not accede to it?"

They are truly injuring their own reputation when they speak many evil things of me, in order to render me ridiculous, and an object of persecution, and yet are unwilling to confront me and prove their accusations by legal testimony. . . . I wish a reciprocal forgiveness. But as it respects the difference with respect to doctrines, it is necessary to be discussed, as that respects the Lutheran community. Mr. Shober has most confidently charged me with teaching 'that if a man only is baptized and partakes of the Lord's Supper, [he] is safe; and that I call those enthusiasts and bigots who insist upon further repentance and conversion.' Again he charges me with openly supporting the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, and of forgiving sins like the papists pretend to do. Now I positively deny these charges as being true, and if Mr. Shober does not confront me and prove these charges by a legal testimony or testimonies, what can I otherwise, agreeably to the truth, call him but a calumniator, or one who bears false witness against his neighbor? I do not believe that any man in the United States (or, at least, I have never heard of any) teaches that, if a person only is baptized and receives the Lord's Supper, [he] is safe exclusive of repentance. What a puerile conduct some men manifest in trying to prove that the doctrine with which Mr. Shober has charged me is erroneous, when no man nor class of men contend for it! They are all the while fighting their own shadows. If the reader will take the trouble to read my book entitled, '*Answer to Mr. Joseph Moore, the Methodist; with a Few Fragments on the Doctrine of Justification,*' he may readily see whether I maintain the doctrines with which I am charged, or whether I deny regeneration and the influence of the Holy Spirit. Again, as little as I believe the doctrine of transubstantiation, so little do I believe that of consubstantiation. A perusal of the book just now mentioned will also satisfy the reader on this subject." (*Tenn. Rep.* 1827, 48.)

#### NORTH CAROLINA RUPTURE.

**77. Charges Preferred by Tennessee Synod.** — The report of the committee which the Tennessee Synod appointed in 1824 to discuss the doctrinal differences with the North Carolina Synod charged them with the following statements of

un-Lutheran doctrine which they quoted from their writings: "1. 'Jesus says, without being baptized; and furthermore He says: He that believeth not shall be damned — hence, baptized or not baptized, faith saves us.' See the committee's appendix to the proceedings of said North Carolina connection of the year 1822, p. 4, § 2. The President of said connection [Stork] says in his *English Review*, p. 46, 'that none but idiots could believe that the body of Christ fills all space.' See also their proceedings of 1820, p. 18." (*Tenn. Rep.* 1824, Appendix.) Accordingly the charges lodged by Tennessee against the North Carolina Synod were that they rejected the distinctive doctrines of Lutheranism. In keeping herewith Tennessee refused to acknowledge the North Carolina Synod as Lutheran, and declined to grant her this title, speaking of her as a connection "which *calls* itself a Lutheran synod." In 1825 the Tennessee Synod declared: "We must here observe that we cannot consistently grant to the Synod of North Carolina this title [Lutheran], because we maintain that they departed from the Lutheran doctrine." (6.) The same convention headed a letter addressed to the North Carolina Synod as follows: "To the Reverend Synod of North Carolina, who assume the title Lutheran, but which we at this time, for reason aforesaid, dispute. Well beloved in the Lord, according to your persons!" etc. (7.) According to a letter of Ambrosius Henkel, March 24, 1824, Riemenschneider declared: "The North Carolina Synod must have deviated not only from the Lutheran doctrine, but from the very words of Christ as well, as I have lately, in one of their publications, read the horrible words: Baptized or not baptized, faith saves us. What is that except to declare Baptism unnecessary? One would think that these people were crazy (man sollte denken, diese Menschen waeren verrueckt)." The North Carolina Synod, however, in spite of their avowed unionistic and essentially Reformed attitude, boldly insisted that they were the "true Lutherans" — a bit of bravado imitated several decades later by Benjamin Kurtz, one of the Reformed theologians of the General Synod, over against Missouri and other synods loyal to the Lutheran Confessions.

**78. "Lutheraner" on Division of North Carolina Synod.** — The first unbiased Lutheran estimate and, in all

essential points, correct presentation of the division in the North Carolina Synod is found in the *Lutheraner* of June 5, 1855. Here Theo. Brohm, who attended the thirty-fourth convention of the Tennessee Synod in 1854 as the representative of the Missouri Synod, writes as follows: "German Lutheran congregations had been organized in the State of North Carolina as early as the middle of the preceding century. About 1798 the first attempts were made to unite these congregations by a regulated synodical bond. However, the removal of a number of pastors resulted in the decay of the church life in this field. After a number of years the congregations increased again, and so the foundation for the Ev. Luth. Synod of North Carolina was laid in 1803. Paul Henkel was among the charter members. The beginning was weak, but the good cause progressed. Gradually Lutheran congregations were organized also in Virginia, South Carolina, and in Tennessee, uniting with this synod. As most of the pastors had come from Pennsylvania, cordial unity obtained between the Pennsylvania Synod and the Synod of North Carolina. In the course of time, however, Satan succeeded in sowing tares among the wheat. Two opposing parties sprang up in the synod. The one, to which the great majority belonged, found its expression and embodiment in the General Synod, and is too well known to our readers to require further characterization at this place. The other was the staunch and truly Lutheran party, to which, indeed, but a small minority adhered. The majority, in agreement with a number of influential men in the Pennsylvania Synod, proposed the idea of a General Synod, which, according to their view, was to embody not only the various Lutheran synods of this country, but, if possible, all other religious bodies as well. While the true Lutherans could see nothing but mischief arising from this General Synod, the majority entered upon this unhappy scheme with great enthusiasm. And, in order to carry out their plan, without the let or hindrance of the staunch Lutherans, the friends of the General Synod convened a meeting of synod in 1819 at an unlawful time, and also without notifying all pastors, especially those of Tennessee. Delegates were elected to the convention of the Pennsylvania Synod in Baltimore, where the plan for the General Synod was to be matured. In order to destroy the in-

fluence of one of the most decided opponents, the young David Henkel, he was suspended from office for a period of six months, ostensibly because he was spreading Roman Catholic doctrines, which in reality, however, were none but pure Lutheran doctrines, especially those of the power of Baptism and of the presence of the true body and blood in the Lord's Supper. When the Synod met at Lincolnton, N. C., in the following year, those members of Synod who were dissatisfied with the resolutions of the previous year demanded a thorough investigation of the mooted questions. In answer reference was made to the majority vote, which decision was to be final. Hostility to the Augsburg Confession and especially to the doctrines of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper, as well as the tendency to unite with all religious bodies, became more and more apparent. And when the plan of the General Synod met with the determined opposition of the staunch Lutherans, the other party dissolved the meeting and made the beginning of the General Synod. Those pastors who remained faithful to the Lutheran Confessions, six in number, now united and organized the so-called Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod." (11, 165.)

### LUTHERANS IN VIRGINIA.

**79. G. Henkel, Stoever, Klug at Spottsylvania.** — In 1754 Muhlenberg and the Pennsylvania Synod sent an appeal to both London and Halle in which they state: "Many thousands of Lutheran people are scattered through North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, etc." When the Indians attacked New Bern, N. C., shortly after it had been founded in 1710 by 650 Palatines and Swiss, twelve Lutheran families escaped from the massacre and sought refuge in Virginia. Here Governor Spottwood allotted them homes in Spottsylvania County. Gerhard Henkel is said to have been their first pastor; but he served them for a short time only. Their number was increased by a colony of Alsatians and Palatinates. They had started for Pennsylvania, but, after various hardships on the voyage, in which many of their companions died, were purchased by Governor Spottwood, and sent by him to his lands in the same locality, on the upper Rappahannock, "twelve German miles from the sea." (Jacobs, 184.) In 1728,

after a vacancy of sixteen years, Henkel was succeeded by John Caspar Stoever, Sr., born in Frankenberg, Hesse, who came to America with his younger relative of the same name, the latter being active for many years as a missionary in Pennsylvania. Stoever's salary in Virginia was three thousand pounds of tobacco a year. In 1734 he and two members of his congregation, Michael Schmidt and Michael Holden, went to Europe to collect a fund for the endowment of their church. "Because the congregation," as an old report has it, "ardently desires that the Evangelical truth should not be extinguished with his death, but be preserved to them and their descendants, the said preacher, Rev. Stoever, toward the close of the year 1734, . . . undertook a voyage to Europe to collect a fund for the continuance of their service, the building of a church and school, and the endowment of the ministry." (G., 115.) In London they were cordially received by Ziegenhagen, and recommended to Germany and Holland. Besides a large amount of money, they procured a library of theological books. George Samuel Klug offered his services as a pastor, and, after his ordination at Danzig, August 30, 1736, proceeded to Virginia with one of the laymen. After completing his collections, Stoever returned, in 1838, but died at sea. The contributions which Stoever had collected amounted to three thousand pounds, one-third of which paid the expenses, and the rest the building of a chapel (Hebron Church) and the purchase of farmlands and slaves. Muhlenberg, Sr., wrote: "It is said to be a profitable plantation, and owns several slaves to till the land." (G., 606.) Pastor Klug, who, in order to relieve the monotony of his isolation, made occasional visits to the Lutheran ministers in Pennsylvania, wrote in 1749 that "the congregation was not in the least burdened by his support." However, the endowment of the church seems to have been a hindrance rather than an advantage. The congregation lost many members to the Dunkards. Klug continued his ministry till 1761, when he was succeeded by Schwarbach, and later by Frank, both of whom were licensed at Culpeper, the latter for three years, beginning with 1775. Probably also Peter Muhlenberg preached in the old Hebron Church. Later on Paul Henkel, when active as a missionary in Virginia, had the congregation under his supervision.

**80. Peter Muhlenberg and J. N. Schmucker at Woodstock.** — Many of the more enterprising of the Germans in Pennsylvania, notably in Montgomery, Berks, Lancaster, and York Counties, pressed toward the frontiers of their State, and then followed the Cumberland Valley into Maryland and far beyond into the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, their number being constantly increased by immigrants from Germany. To supply their needs, Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, in 1772, was sent to Virginia, Woodstock (Muellerstadt) being his home and the center of his field. Though serving practically none but German Lutherans, he sought and secured the ordination of the Episcopal Church in order to obtain legal recognition of his marriages. In Virginia the Protestant Episcopal Church was firmly established, and dissenters were compelled to pay an annual tribute to the established preachers. Says Muhlenberg, Sr.: "If dissenting parties were married by their own pastors, this was not legal, and they could not get off any cheaper than by paying the marriage dues to the established county preacher and obtaining a marriage certificate from him." (G., 606.) Together with W. White, afterward Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania, Peter Muhlenberg was ordained by the Bishop of London, after he had been examined and had subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles. By the indifferentistic Germans and Swedes of those days such ordinations were generally regarded as a favor and comity from the Episcopalianists rather than a humiliation and denial on the part of the Lutherans. Dr. Kunze says: "The bishops of London have never made a difficulty to ordain Lutheran divines, when called to congregations which, on account of being connected with English Episcopalianists, made this ordination requisite. Thus by bishops of London the following Lutheran ministers were ordained: Bryselius, Peter Muhlenberg, Illing, Houssal, and Wagner. The last-mentioned was called, after having obtained this ordination, to an Ev. Lutheran congregation in the Margraviate of Anspach in Germany." (Jacobs, 285.) Peter Muhlenberg viewed his Episcopal ordination as a purely civil affair, and, though claimed by the Episcopalianists, he always regarded himself as a Lutheran. He died (1807) with the conviction that he had never been anything but a Lutheran. In a circular to the Lutheran churches of Philadelphia, dated

March 14, 1804, he said: "Brethren, we have been born, baptized, and brought up in the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Many of us have vowed before God and the congregation, at our confirmation, to live and die by this doctrine of our Church. In the doctrine of our Church we have our joy, our brightest joy; we prize it the more highly since, in our opinion, it agrees most with the doctrine of the faithful and true witness of our Savior Jesus Christ. We wish nothing more than that we and our children and our children's children and all our posterity may remain faithful to this doctrine." (284.) Among the friends of Peter Muhlenberg at Woodstock were George Washington and the orator of the Revolution, Patrick Henry. The story is well known how, after preaching a sermon on the seriousness of the times and pronouncing the benediction, he cast off his clerical robe, appearing before his congregation in the glittering uniform of a colonel. During the long vacancy which followed Wildbahn, Goering, and J. D. Kurtz preached occasionally in the old church at Woodstock. In 1805 John Nicholas Schmucker took charge of the field. He was a popular preacher, using, almost exclusively, also in the pulpit, the Pennsylvania German. "Zu so Kinner," he said, "muss mer so predige." (G., 608.)

**81. Patriotic Activity of Peter Muhlenberg.** — Peter was the oldest son of H. M. Muhlenberg. He was sent to the University of Halle for his theological training, where his independent spirit soon brought him into trouble. At one occasion he resented an insult on the part of his instructor with a blow. Forestalling expulsion, the young man enlisted in a German regiment, in which he was known as "Teufel Piet." After two years of military training he returned to America, and consented to study theology under his father. After a short pastorate in New Jersey he was transferred to Woodstock. He traveled extensively through the Shenandoah Valley and the mountains to the west, preaching wherever Lutherans could be found. When the Revolution began, Peter Muhlenberg roused the patriotism of his fellow-Germans in Virginia, who were much better established and in closer touch with their English neighbors than those in North Carolina, many of them being acquainted with Lord Fairfax and George

Washington and holding civil offices in their communities. Muhlenberg brought about, and was chairman of, the Woodstock Convention, June 16, 1774, at which the Germans united with their Scotch-Irish neighbors in a declaration against British tyranny, nearly a year before the famous Mecklenburg Declaration in May, 1775. The resolutions adopted at Woodstock were prepared by a committee, of which Muhlenberg was chairman. They read, in part, as follows: "That we will pay due submission to such acts of government as His Majesty has a right by law to exercise over his subjects, and to such only." "That it is the inherent right of British subjects to be governed and taxed by representatives chosen by themselves only, and that every act of the British Parliament respecting the internal policy of America is a dangerous and unconstitutional invasion of our rights and privileges." "That the enforcing of the execution of the said act of Parliament by military power will have a necessary tendency to cause a civil war, thereby dissolving that union which has so long happily subsisted between the mother country and her colonies; and that we will most heartily and unanimously concur with our suffering brethren of Boston and every other part of North America that may be the immediate victim of tyranny, as promoting all proper measures to avert such dreadful calamities to procure a redress of our grievances and to secure our common liberties." After the Woodstock meeting Muhlenberg was elected a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia and also of the State Convention. He was appointed colonel of the Eighth regiment, afterwards known as the German regiment, which he also raised. After receiving his commission, Muhlenberg preached the famous war sermon which Colonel Roosevelt, several years ago, repeated in *Collier's Weekly*, in his plea for fair play for the Germans. Beneath his black pulpit robe, which is to-day in the possession of the Henkel Brothers' Publishing House, Peter Muhlenberg wore his uniform. In his sermon he spoke of the duties citizens owe to their country. In closing he said: "There is a time for preaching and praying; but there is also a time of fighting; now this time has come!" The service ended, he retired to the sacristy and came out the colonel. He made a speech from the front steps of his church and began the enlistment, 300 signing.

In the war he distinguished himself at Brandywine, Germantown, Monmouth, and Yorktown, and was advanced to the rank of Major-General. The war over, Peter Muhlenberg served as Speaker of the House in Congress and afterwards as United States Senator. (*Luth. Church Review* 1919, 160 ff.)

**82. Chr. Streit at Winchester, Henkel at New Market.**

— In 1785 Christian Streit, who had been active in New Hanover, Pa., since 1782, came to Winchester, Va., where he served till 1812. Here the foundations for a church had been laid in 1764. According to a document found in the cornerstone, the congregation, then numbering 33 members, declared: "This temple is dedicated to the Triune God and the Lutheran religion; all sects, whatsoever their names may be, departing from, or not fully agreeing with, the Evangelical Lutheran religion, shall forever be excluded from it." This document was signed by Caspar Kirchner, then pastor of the congregation, L. Adams, secretary, and Anton Ludi, schoolteacher. By the aid of a lottery the church was completed under Chr. Streit in 1787. William Carpenter, a scholar of Streit, labored in Madison Co., Va., from 1791 to 1813, when he removed to Kentucky. Augusta County, in the Shenandoah Valley, was almost exclusively settled by Germans, the Koiner (Coyner, Koyner, Coiner, Kiner, Cuyner) family, hailing from Wuerttemberg, being especially numerous. New Market, Shenandoah County, was the home of Paul Henkel (1754—1825), who had studied German, Latin, Greek, and Theology under the direction of Pastor Krug in Pennsylvania, and was ordained at Philadelphia in 1792. A most zealous and energetic missionary, his journeys carried him into Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana. From 1800 to 1805 he was stationed in Rowan Co., N. C., and took part in the organization of the Synod of North Carolina in 1803. Returning to Virginia in 1805, he, together with his six sons, established a printery at New Market, which loyally served the cause of true Lutheranism. As the years rolled on, the Henkels became increasingly free from the prevailing doctrinal indifferentism, and arrived at an ever clearer understanding of Lutheran truth, and this at a time when all existing Lutheran synods were moving in the opposite direction. The

Lutheran loyalty and determination of the Henkels over against the unionistic and Reformed tendencies within the North Carolina Synod led to the organization of the Tennessee Synod, July 17, 1820, a synod which espoused the cause of pure Lutheranism, and zealously opposed the enthusiastic, unionistic, and Reformed aberrations then prevalent in all other Lutheran synods of America. Two years prior, September 14, 1818, Paul Henkel had participated in the organization of the Ohio Synod, at first called the General Conference of Evangelical Lutheran Pastors, etc. On October 11, 1820, conferences, which had met since 1793, led to the organization of the Synod of Maryland and Virginia at Winchester, Va., by ten pastors and nine delegates. Nine years later the Virginia Synod was organized; and the Southwest Virginia Synod, September 20, 1841.

#### SPECIAL CONFERENCE IN VIRGINIA.

83. **Minutes of 1805.** — In the first decade of the nineteenth century a Special Conference was organized in Virginia: "Spezialkonferenz der Evang.-Luth. Prediger (Lehrer) und Abgeordneten im Staat Virginien." At the meeting held on Sunday, October 7, 1805, in the newly built church at Millerstadt (Woodstock), five lay delegates (among them Doctor Solomon Henkel) and the following ministers were present: Chr. Streit, W. Carpenter, Paul Henkel, J. Foltz, A. Spintler. Streit delivered a touching sermon (eine ruehrende Rede) in the Lutheran church on Matt. 28, 20. In the afternoon Paul Henkel preached in the Reformed church on 2 Cor. 4, 5; in the evening, Carpenter on 1 Cor. 1, 23, also in the Reformed church. Monday morning they met in the schoolhouse. At 12 o'elock Spintler preached in the Reformed church on Eph. 1, 7. In the afternoon it was decided that an address to the congregations be added to the minutes "on better bringing up of the children and better order of the youth." On motion of Solomon Henkel it was resolved to add to the minutes also the 21 articles of the Augsburg Confession. Furthermore it was resolved that after the sermon the children should be instructed in the catechism. It was also approved to abolish as far as possible the

custom of saying the individual lines of the hymns in public worship (die Lieder zeilenweise vorzusprechen). The address added to the minutes says, in part: "If children are to grow up well-bred and be reared to the honor of God, then the teachers in the churches, the schoolteachers in the school-houses, and the parents in their dwellings must perform their various duties toward the young plants in the vineyard of the Lord." "Generally men care for the bodily welfare of their children, which in itself is not wrong; why, then, should we not also, and indeed much more so, be concerned about their everlasting and eternal welfare?" "O parents, parents! seek to save yourselves and, as much as is in you, also your children! Do not spare any trouble or expenses to have your children instructed in the fundamental truths of our holy religion. Send them, according to your ability and the circumstances, to school regularly, especially to such schools where they are trained, not only for this world, but for heaven also, where they are instructed in song, prayer, and the doctrine of the catechism." "In our corrupted times some parents permit their children to waste the whole day of the holy Sabbath in a disorderly and sinful manner rather than bring them to the teacher in order to have them instructed for half an hour to their temporal and eternal welfare. O parents, parents! is that the way to bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? O remember that, who knows how soon, you with your dear children will have to appear before God's judgment! O ponder what a fearful and terrible thing it would be, if at that great day your own children should have to accuse and condemn you there before the throne of God!" With respect to the grown-up youth the address complains: "We cannot, in truth, think of many of you without shedding tears. Many of you do not only despise your mother tongue, but with it your mother church. Many, at least among those of our acquaintance, born of Evangelical Lutheran parents, neglect the instruction which they could have so conveniently, neglect confirmation and the Lord's Supper, and frequently behave in public worship in a manner to make one feel almost ashamed of them, and thus they live in the world without religion and without God."

**84. Minutes of 1807, etc.** — To the minutes of 1807 a formula for burial, furnished by Henkel, is added for the use of schoolteachers in the absence of a minister. At the meeting in the schoolhouse at Winchester, 1808, it was resolved that the congregations elect devout men to conduct reading-services and give catechetical instruction to the children on Sundays when ministers are absent. It was furthermore resolved that ministers should conduct, as often as possible, private meetings in their congregations in order to edify the members by prayer, song, and instruction. The admonition, written by Paul Henkel and Streit, and added to the minutes, in a simple and earnest manner urges the congregations to introduce the reading-services, the instruction of the young, and to attend the private meetings. "Coldness and indifference in religion," they say, "is so universal that we must employ all possible means to awaken men to a true and living Christianity." A special and fervent appeal is added not to abuse, but to keep, the Sabbath, the Day of the Lord, "the good, useful, holy day, which God especially has reserved for Himself for the furtherance of His honor and the welfare of our immortal souls." The appeal concludes: "Do you love your country? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you love civic rest? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you love your neighbors? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you love your children? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you love your parents? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you love your preachers, your Savior, and your souls? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you desire to escape hell? Then sanctify the Sabbath. Do you desire some day to celebrate the eternal Sabbath with the saints and the perfected just before the throne of God? Then sanctify the Sabbath here on earth, whereby you may be best prepared for those blissful occupations." At the meeting of the Special Conference in the school of Solomon's Church, Shenandoah County, 1809, it was resolved that the admonition to be added to the minutes of this year should take "special reference to the furtherance of the German language and schools." The admonition, written by Paul Henkel and Carpenter, complains that the ministers were not able to do their mission-duty, partly because they were rich and unable to undergo the hardships connected with traveling,

partly because the congregations supporting them refused to let them go. They admonish the congregations to show their brotherly love in permitting their ministers to serve their forsaken and needy brethren. Respecting the cultivation of the German language, the admonition remarks, in part: "In the first place, we know that the English language is not as easily understood as the German. Even when the Germans are able to read and write it, they understand very little of it aright. Their parents, themselves not knowing the language, can hear their children read, and see them write, but cannot show them where they err, nor correct them. And just as little are they able to explain to them the contents of what they read; for [even] the English understand very little of what they read in some useful books, until they learn to understand it from their dictionaries." "If parents were really concerned about training their children for the general weal of the country, they would see to it that their sons be taught the Christian religion in their mother-tongue as well as be instructed in the English language to read, write, figure, etc. Then they might become truly useful men for the general welfare of their country. All the most useful men that one can point out in our country are, as a rule, of this class. It cannot be expected that men who, for reasons of selfishness and pride, despise their language and church will stand for the welfare of their country." The admonition concludes: "We know how much good and wholesome instruction for the edification of our souls and for the comfort of our hearts we have derived from our German books, which are so easily understood, and which so plainly describe the simple way of life. From what we learned from them ever since our youth, we have obtained our only hope of salvation hereafter; why, then, should we, for any reason whatsoever, deprive our children of it?" According to the statistical appendix of the minutes of the Special Conference in 1809, there were, at that time, no less than 49 organized congregations in Virginia. It does not, however, appear that the interest in the German language and the consciousness of true Lutheranism made any marked progress in the following years. In 1817, at Culpeper, Pastors G. Riemenschneider, A. Reck, Nicholas and

Peter Schmucker, and Michael Meyerhoeffer, and five lay delegates were present. Four German and three English sermons were delivered. Among the resolutions is the following: "that only pious and, if possible, only converted men be chosen as elders of the congregations, and that they live piously both in their homes with family prayer in the evening and morning, and before the world respectably and honorably, receive the Lord's Supper frequently," etc. Instead of any reference to the tercentenary of the Reformation we find in the minutes of 1817 a resolution to the effect "that the proceedings of this year, together with a *Letter of a Traveling Jew* appended, be printed."

#### SYNOD OF MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

**85. Always Prominent and Liberal.** — The Synod of Maryland and Virginia, organized October 11, 1820, has always been prominent in the General Synod. "The *Lutheran Observer*, the Pastors' Fund, the Lutheran Ministers' Insurance League, the Missionary Institute, now Susquehanna University, were all born in this venerable Synod, which was also first to suggest the observance of Reformation Day. Lutherville and Hagerstown Female Seminaries are within its bounds. It has always been abreast of the most advanced, evangelical, and catholic life of the Church, giving no uncertain sound upon the divine obligation of the Lord's Day and the saloon." (J. G. Butler in the *Luth. Cycl.*, 482.) Among its noted pastors were J. D. and B. Kurtz, J. G. Morris, F. W. Conrad, S. W. Harkey, Theo. and C. A. Stork, D. F. Schaeffer, C. Philip and C. Porterfield Krauth, S. S. Schmucker, H. L. Baugher, Sr., W. A. Passavant, Sr., Ezra Keller. But men of this synod also led the van in doctrinal and practical liberalism. Harkey and Kurtz were New-measurists and enthusiastic revivalists. Harkey moved the publication of a monthly, *The Revivalist*, which Synod, however, declared "inexpedient." Through the endeavors of Kurtz a committee was appointed to bring in a report on the "New Measures," which was referred back to the committee. In 1844 Synod resolved to issue an "Abstract of the Doctrines and Practise of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Maryland." Fourteen doctrinal articles were prepared by H. L. Baugher, B. Kurtz, and S. W. Harkey, containing, among other

statements, also the following: "We believe that the Scriptures teach that God has given to man, as a natural gift, the power of choice, and that, whilst he is influenced in his volitions by motives, he always possesses the ability to choose the opposite of that which was the object of his choice. God, in His providence and grace, places before man the evil and the good, urging him by the most powerful considerations to choose the latter and reject the former. When the sinner yields to God, that is regeneration." "We believe that the Scriptures teach that there are but two Sacraments, *viz.*, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in each of which truths essential to salvation are symbolically represented. We do not believe that they exert any influence *ex opere operato*, but only through the faith of the believer. Neither do the Scriptures warrant the belief that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in any other than a spiritual manner." "We regard them [the Lutheran Symbols] as good and useful exhibitions of truth, but do not receive them as binding on the conscience, except so far as they agree with the Word of God." Evidently these articles of the Maryland "Abstract," as A. Spaeth puts it, "not only avoid or contradict the distinctive features of the Lutheran Confession, but have a decided savor of Arminianism and Pelagianism." (*C. P. Krauth*, 1, 111 f.) October 17, 1856, the Maryland Synod declared that every one is at liberty to accept or reject the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession which the "Definite Platform" rejected as false, provided that thereby the divine institution of the Sabbath be not rejected, nor the doctrinal basis of the General Synod changed. (*L. u. W.* 1856, 382.)

**86. Maryland Abstract of Doctrines.** — On the un-Lutheran, Reformed, and Arminian articles of the Maryland "Abstract" we quote Dr. A. Spaeth as follows: "This report was first recommitted, and, in 1846, was laid on the table and indefinitely postponed. The *Lutheran Observer* referred to it in an extended editorial (November 27, 1846), and printed it in full, with a few slight alterations and omissions. We quote from this article as follows: 'When asked what Lutherans believe, the question is not always so easily answered to the satisfaction of the inquirer. We may refer him to books, con-

fessions, catechisms, etc.; but the proponent, most probably, has neither inclination nor time to hunt up and examine such authorities. He desires to be told in a few words, distinctly and definitely, what is the prevailing belief in the Lutheran Church on all fundamental points of religious truth. A short tract, a page or two comprehending an epitome of the doctrines and usages of the mass of Lutheran Christians in the United States, is what would suit him. Is there anything of this kind to be found in the Church? The want of it has long been felt and expressed. From the North and the South, the East and the West, we have been asked for something of this nature. The question assumed such importance that it was finally agitated some two years ago in the Synod of Maryland, and afterward in the General Synod (1846), held in Philadelphia. In both instances committees were appointed to draw up and report an abstract of our "doctrine and practise." The committee appointed by the Maryland Synod complied; and though the "Abstract" itself was approved, the Synod, for reasons which we have not time at present to explain, did not think proper to adopt the report and recommend it to the Church. The committee was composed of some of our most intelligent and valued ministers; when they had prepared it, they sent a copy to every minister of the Synod, soliciting his emendations on the margin, and after its final return it was reprinted with the benefit of these emendations; and it is in this improved form that we now present it. We find no difficulty in subscribing the document, and in presenting it as a fair, honest exhibition of Lutheran doctrine and practise as understood in the latitude in which we reside; and if we are not greatly mistaken, the great mass of our American ministers throughout the land would not make any material objection to it.''" Dr. Spaeth continues: "This attempt to substitute such an 'abstract' for the full and precise language of the Confession of the Church was a sort of forerunner of the famous 'Definite Platform,' which appeared about ten years afterward, and whose principal author, Prof. S. S. Schmucker in Gettysburg, was so much pleased with the 'abstract' that he referred to it again and again in his lectures and articles, and even made his students commit to memory its principal statements. In

an article on the 'Vocation of the American Lutheran Church' (*Evangelical Review*, Vol. II, p. 510) he says: 'With the exception of several minor shades of doctrine, in which we are more symbolic than Dr. Baugher, we could not ourselves, in so few words, give a better description of the views taught in the Seminary [Gettysburg] than that contained in his "Abstract of the Doctrines and Practise," etc. No ground of apprehension as to our seminary, since the doctrines of our Symbols and the prevailing doctrines of our American Church are here faithfully taught.' " (112.)

---

## The Tennessee Synod.

---

### ORGANIZATION.

87. "German Ev. Luth. Conference of Tennessee." — Although the Tennessee Synod has always been and is now only one of the smaller American Lutheran synods, its history reveals much that is gratifying, instructive, edifying, and interesting. The first report is entitled: "Report of the transactions of the first conference of the German Ev. Luth. pastors and deputies held in the State of Tennessee, in Solomon's Church, Cove Creek, Green Co., on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of July, 1820." The conference was organized by Pastors Jacob Zink of Virginia, Paul Henkel of Virginia, Adam Miller of Tennessee, Philip Henkel of Tennessee, George Esterly of Tennessee, and David Henkel of North Carolina (who was unable to attend the first meeting), and 19 deputies of congregations in Tennessee. (*Bericht* 1820, 3.) By 1827 the number of pastors had increased to 14, by 1856 to 32, and by 1900 to 40. At present the Tennessee Synod numbers about 130 congregations and 14,500 communicants. The name "Synod" appears for the first time in the English Report of 1825, and is found in the constitution since 1827. In the minutes of 1820 we read: "Firstly, it was deemed necessary and good that all business and proceedings of this conference, or synod, shall be conducted in the German language. All written reports of the proceedings belonging to the whole shall also be published in the German language." (4.) Synod also regarded it "as most necessary that we be as diligent as possible to acquaint our children with all our doctrines of faith in our German language, since in it we are able to instruct them in the easiest way." (9.) A foot-note makes the following comment: "The reason why we desire a purely German-speaking conference: Experience has taught us that where a conference is German-English, either the one or the other party considers itself offended. When German is spoken, the English brethren understand little, and very frequently nothing at all. When English is spoken, many

a German brother is unable to grasp the matter, and accordingly unable to judge in questions of the greatest importance. Besides, at the present time there are very few purely English pastors who accept the doctrine of our Church and desire to preach it." (4.) The same sentiments are voiced in the following statement of this report: "False Lutherans prefer to seek entrance among the German church-people, because they still contribute most to the support of the ministry. Some Germans also of our day are of such a kind that if they are able to preach a little English, no matter how broken and jargonlike it is spoken, they are inflated with such senseless pride that they would no longer preach a thing in their mother-tongue nor care the least for the order of the Church, if it were not a question of bread and of keeping the good will of some obdurate Germans. They preach because they take pleasure in hearing themselves. Those who are really English and understand their language do not care to hear such, except at times, and then for their amusement only. The Germans therefore are under no obligations to the good will of such sirs, when they serve them in their language and according to their order." (31.) Originally, then, the Tennessee Synod was determined to be and to remain a purely German-speaking body.

**88. Attitude toward the English Language.** — That the interest manifested by the Tennessee Synod in the German language was not due to any unreasonable prejudice or hatred toward the English language as such, appears from the fact that since 1821 the minutes of Synod were printed both in English and German. Moreover, in the minutes of the second convention, 1821, we read: "At the request of some of our brethren of North Carolina it was resolved that there be annually a synod held in North Carolina, or in an adjoining State in the English language. The members of the German Tennessee Synod may also help to compose this Synod. It shall be governed agreeably to the same constitution as that of the German Tennessee Synod (the language excepted). Those who compose this Synod may appoint the place and time of the meeting, when and where they may deem it expedient." (Report 1821, 7.) The Report of 1822 records: "Resolved: Be-

cause this Synod is German-speaking, and Mr. Blalock not understanding this language, he cannot therefore have a seat and vote in this body. Yet, the Revs. Paul and David Henkel are allowed as individual ministers to examine him, and in case he is qualified, to ordain him. It is to be understood that Mr. Blalock is to be ordained a minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; but in case he should acquire a knowledge of the German language, which he expects to do, he can then have a seat and vote in the German synod. But whilst he understands the English language only, he may with other ministers, who walk agreeably to the doctrines and rules of the German synod, organize an English-speaking synod, in conformity to a resolution passed last year." (5.) In 1826 the resolution was adopted: "Whereas there are sundry members belonging to this Synod who do not understand the German language, and yet do not wish to form a separate body, it was resolved that the Secretary, during this session, shall act as an interpreter between the German and English brethren. It was further resolved that at the next session, during the three first days, all the business shall be transacted in the German language, *i. e.*, if so much time shall be requisite; after which the business shall be resumed in the English language." (3.) The anxiety caused by the language-question appears from the following letter of Philip Henkel, dated October 19, 1826: "After my return from Synod, I found our German congregation-members very much dissatisfied because they believed that we had violated the constitution, and I am afraid that a separation will be the result. For the old Germans will never suffer the Tennessee Synod to become a German-English-speaking body. We must certainly act carefully in this matter, otherwise our Synod will be ruined. . . . They said that they were willing to sacrifice the constitution, provided that we remain an exclusively German-speaking body. I also am willing to relinquish the constitution, provided that the Augsburg Confession is made the constitution of this synod. We shall find that we shall not be able to keep the Germans and English together, even when we conduct synod at the same place three days in the German and three days in the English language, for the Germans will have to suffer the burden. The English will always want to attend; then they are coarsely treated by

the Germans; the English complain; thus the matter will be ruined. My advice, therefore, is: Let us always hold a German-speaking synod, and afterwards an English-speaking one. In this way we shall be able to exist. For my part, I am willing to attend both. Every constitution except the Augsburg Confession may then be set aside. If the Germans refuse to maintain their language, we can't help it, and we are not at fault if they perish. If you approve the plan of holding first an exclusively German-speaking synod and then an exclusively English-speaking synod, and also of abolishing every constitution except the Augsburg Confession, advise me at your earliest convenience. I will then write to the rest of the preachers, and appoint the time and place for synod. This seems to be the only means of keeping our people united, for at present they are apart, and who knows how we may bring them together. After the constitution has been transgressed, everybody feels free. But if the Augsburg Confession were the constitution, every member would readily agree to it. These are my thoughts. Write soon. Philip Henkel." (L. u. W. 60, 63.) In the minutes of 1827 we read: "14. Some members of this congregation alleged the following charge against Mr. Adam Miller, Jr.: that he neglected to officiate in the German language, and thus deprived those of religious instructions and edification who do not understand the English. The Synod was convinced of the justice of the complaint, and considered it highly necessary that these brethren should be served in the German language. Mr. Miller, in defense of his conduct, said that he did not understand the German language accurately and therefore could not officiate in it, and that hitherto he has not had an opportunity of learning it. But he promised to acquire a more accurate knowledge of this language, provided his congregations were willing to spare him from their service for one year. He intends to study this language with David Henkel. The members of his congregations who were present agreed for him to do so, but requested to be visited a few times by some of the other ministers during the time they should be vacant. The Synod highly approved Mr. Miller's resolution, and wished him to persevere in this laudable undertaking." (12.) The Synod of 1827 was confronted by conflicting petitions as to the language-question. The following

memorials were read: "1. A memorial from St. James's Church in Greene County, Tenn., subscribed by 23 persons. They pray this Synod not to alter the constitution. Further, that this body remain exclusively German, and that some measures be taken to establish a separate English Synod. . . . 4. In a letter in which the Rev. Adam Miller, Sr., states the reasons of his absence, he prays this body to allow the English brethren equal privileges, so that they may not be under the necessity of establishing a separate Synod." (14.) The constitution, which was proposed at this meeting and accepted in the following year, disposed of this question as follows: "All debates shall first be held in the German language, whereupon the same shall be resumed in the English; provided there shall be both German and English members present. After the debates on a subject shall have been ended, then the decision shall be made." (R. 1827, 24; B. 1828, 28.) In the following years the English language rapidly gained the ascendency, until finally the German disappeared entirely. (R. 1831, 9; B. 1841, 8. 9.) Rev. Th. Brohm, after visiting the Tennessee Synod, wrote in the *Lutheraner* of January 2, 1855: "Though of German origin, the Tennessee Synod in the course of time has lost its German element, and has become a purely English synod."

**89. Born of Lutheran Loyalty.** — The organization of the Tennessee Synod came as a protest against the projected General Synod, and especially against existing conditions in the Synod of North Carolina, to which the Tennessee pastors belonged until their secession in 1820. March 14, 1820, Philip Henkel had written to his brother: "If I am spared, I shall attend synod. . . . If the old ministers will not act agreeably to the Augsburg Confession, we will erect a synod in Tennessee." The "old ministers" were Stork, Shober, Jacob and Daniel Sherer, and other pastors of the North Carolina Synod who advocated a union with the sects and the connection with the General Synod, and sought to suppress such testimony on behalf of Lutheran truth and consistency as the Henkels had begun to bear publicly. Aversion to faithful confessional Lutheranism was the real reason why the Synod of North Carolina in 1816 refused to ordain the young, but able David Henkel, which, even at that time, almost resulted in a with-

drawal of the Henkels and their delegates. The tension was greatly increased when the Synod of 1819 degraded David Henkel to the rank of catechist, on the false charge that he had preached transubstantiation and other papistic heresies and thereby given offense to the "Reformed brethren." As a matter of fact, he had proclaimed the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The North Carolina Synod made the entry into their minutes. "He [David Henkel] is therefore no preacher of the Lutheran Church of North Carolina and adjacent States." (G., 696.) A source of additional ill will was the autocratic procedure of the officers in arbitrarily convening the Synod of 1819, five weeks before the constitutional time (whence known as the "Untimely Synod"), and that without sending out notices sufficiently early, and for a purpose most odious to the Henkels and their adherents, *viz.*, *to elect a delegate* (Shober was chosen) to the convention of the Pennsylvania Synod at Baltimore in order to participate in the framing of a tentative constitution for the projected General Synod. Resenting the arrogance and unconstitutional action of the officers as well as the obnoxious resolutions of the "Untimely Synod," those members of the North Carolina Synod who had been either unwilling or unable (having been notified too late) to take part in the deliberations of the "Untimely Synod," five weeks later, at the time prescribed by the constitution, held a synod of their own at Buffalo Creek, in Stork's congregation, where the "Untimely Synod" had been held, under the oaks, near the church, Stork having refused them the use of the church for this purpose. "The Synod," Stork declared, "has been held; and there is no need of holding it again." He ordered his elders not to open the church, but finally permitted them to hold services there, with the express proviso, however, that no business was to be transacted in it. (B. 1820, 21.) Philip Henkel was elected president, and Bell and David Henkel were ordained. (21.) In the following year, a few months after the so-called "Quarreling Synod" ("Streitsynode"), where the majority of the North Carolina Synod decided in favor of a union with the General Synod, the minority, as related above, organized the Tennessee Synod. (15.) In the minutes (Bericht) of 1820, the members of the new synod justify their withdrawal and organization as a separate body by calling attention especially to the

following points: 1. The officers and some of the members of the North Carolina Synod had proven by their words and actions that they "could no longer be regarded as truly Evangelical Lutheran pastors." (12. 15.) 2. The "Untimely Synod" had declared the excommunication of a member of David Henkel's congregation to be invalid, without investigating the matter in that congregation, thereby infringing upon the rights of the congregation. (20.) 3. The same synod had not rebuked its president, Rev. Stork, when he made the statement that he could not believe the Lutheran doctrine that Christ as man was in possession of all divine attributes, and that he would not believe it if 500 Bibles should say so. 4. The Synod of 1820 had declared David Henkel's ordination "under the oaks" invalid, and had published a sort of letter of excommunication against him. (22.) 5. Synod had refused to settle the mooted questions according to the Augsburg Confession and the synodical constitution, but, instead, had demanded that the minority should yield to the majority. "We, however, thought," says the Report, "that the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession (concerning which we were convinced that it could be proven by the doctrine of the Bible) should have greater weight with us than the voice of a majority of men who are opposed to the doctrine and ordinance of our Church." (23.) 6. Synod had permitted the un-Lutheran remarks made at the convention and elsewhere on Baptism, the Eucharist, Election, Conversion, and the certainty of the state of grace, as well as on union with all religious parties, to pass unreproved.—Stating the causes of the deplorable schism, David Henkel wrote in 1827: "A most unhappy difference exists between this body and the North Carolina Synod. Previous to the year 1820 some members of the former and some of the latter constituted one Synod. In this year the North Carolina Synod entered into the connection of a General Synod with some other synods. This is a connection and institution which heretofore did not exist in the Lutheran community, and to which the Tennessee Synod object as an institution calculated to subvert ecclesiastical liberty, and to prepare the way for innovations. This, together with the difference in regard to some of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, are the principal reasons of the division." (R. 1827, 32.) In brief, the organization of the Ten-

nessee Synod was a solemn protest against synodical tyranny and anticonfessional teaching then prevailing in the North Carolina Synod and in all other Lutheran bodies in America. Accordingly, as compared with her contemporaries, it remains the peculiar glory of the Tennessee Synod that she was born of Lutheran loyalty.

**90. Back to Luther! Back to the Lutheran Symbols!—** Such, in substance and effect, was the slogan sounded by the Tennessee Synod, for the first time in the history of the Lutheran Church in America, after long years of confessional disloyalty and of doctrinal and practical deterioration. By dint of earnest and conscientious study of the Lutheran Symbols and of Luther's writings, the Tennessee pastors, in particular the Henkels, had attained to a clear knowledge of Lutheran truth and practise, thereby, at the same time, becoming fully convinced that of all teachings in Christendom the Lutheran doctrine alone is in full accord with Holy Writ. March 13, 1823, Solomon Henkel wrote: "A week ago Mr. York was here, bringing with him Luther's Works. They are bound in 13 folio volumes and cost \$100. I purchased the books." To penetrate deeper and deeper into the writings of Luther, to persuade others to do the same, and to make this possible to them, such was the ardent desire and earnest endeavor of the Tennessee pastors. Evidently with this purpose in view, Paul Henkel had established a printery at New Market, Va., where books and tracts breathing a Lutheran spirit were published. Synodical colporteurs diligently canvassed them among the congregations. Sound Lutheran works, *e. g.*, the Augsburg Confession, sermons by Luther and Arndt, the article on Good Works from the Formula of Concord, were from time to time, by resolution of Synod, appended to the synodical reports. (1831, 11.) Nor was their zeal satisfied with fostering true Lutheranism in their own midst. In order to acquaint the English-speaking public with the truths and treasures of our Church, they issued translations of standard Lutheran works. Besides an agenda and a hymnal, the New Market printery published in 1829 an English translation of Luther's Small Catechism with notes by David Henkel; in 1834, a translation of the Augsburg Confession with a preface by Karl Henkel (in 1827 David Henkel

had already been commissioned to prepare a correct translation); in 1851, an English version of the entire Book of Concord, of which a second and improved edition appeared in 1854; in 1852, "Luther on the Sacraments," being translations of some writings of Luther by Jos. Salyards and Solomon D. Henkel, 423 pages octavo; in 1869, Luther's Epistle Sermons, an English edition of which had been determined upon in 1855. (Rep. 1826, 7; 1830, 17; 1841, 15; 1855, 14.) On March 1, 1824, a certain Sam Blankenbecker wrote to David Henkel: "There are two sorts of Lutherans: the one sort believes there is no doctrine right and pure but the Lutheran; the other thinks that also the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists are equally right and pure; and such Lutherans are very hurtful to others." The Tennessee Synod belonged to the first class. They were conscious Lutherans, who knew what they were and what they stood for. The fact is that in those days Tennessee was the only synod with a true Lutheran heart and an honest Lutheran face.

**91. Despised and Ostracized.** — Their return to Luther and the Lutheran Symbols brought the Henkels and the Tennessee Synod into direct opposition to, and sharp conflict with, all other Lutheran synods of that day. For, though still bearing, and priding themselves on, the Lutheran name, they all had long ago begun to abandon the confessions and distinctive doctrines of the Church which the cherished and coveted name of Luther stood for. Their leaders had become indifferentists, unionists, and Reformed and Methodistic enthusiasts. Over against this lack of Lutheran faithfulness and apostasy from the Confessions the Henkels gave no uncertain testimony. Being Lutherans in their hearts as well as in their heads, they boldly confessed the truths, and most energetically championed the cause of genuine Lutheranism. And they squared their actions with their words and convictions. Consistent also in their practise, they refused to fellowship and recognize the errorists everywhere, even when found in Lutheran synods. No wonder, then, that the Henkels and their uncompromising attitude met with no sympathy on the part of the Lutheran synods then found in America. And, being, as they were, a standing protest against the apostasy of these synods, it

was but natural, carnally, that the Tennessee confessors were avoided, ignored, despised, hated, maligned, and ostracized by their opponents. Tennessee was decried and stigmatized as the "Quarreling Conference" ("Streitkonferenz"). The "Henkelites," it was said, had been convicted of error at the "Quarreling Synod"; there they had not been able to prove their doctrine; they were false Lutherans; some of them had been excluded from Synod, therefore they had no authority to officiate as ministers; their synod was not a lawful synod; its transactions were invalid, etc. (1820, 22. 30; 1824, App. 3; 1827, 43 f.) All endeavors on the part of the Tennessee Synod to bring about an understanding and a unification in the truth were spurned by the other synods "with silent contempt," says David Henkel. (1827, 6. 25.) In the Maryland Synod the prediction was heard: "This Tennessee Synod will go to pieces finally." The Address of the General Synod of 1823 states: "Our Church, which was originally embraced in two independent synods [Ministeriums of Pennsylvania and New York], has spread over so extensive a portion of the United States that at present we have *five* synods [North Carolina, Ohio, Maryland and Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York Synods], and shall shortly have several more." (3. 9. 14.) The General Synod, then, refused to recognize Tennessee as a Lutheran synod in America. In a letter, dated January 23, 1826, and addressed to Solomon Henkel, H. Muhlenberg remarked that the Tennessee Synod "had as yet not been recognized as a synod by the other Lutheran synods." In 1839 the General Synod censured both the Franckean and Tennessee Synods as the two extremes "causing disturbances and divisions in our churches" and standing in the way of a union of the Lutheran Church in America — a resolution which was rescinded in 1864. Thus universal contempt and proscription was the reward which Tennessee received for her endeavors to lead the Lutheran Church out of the mire of sectarian aberrations back to Luther and the Lutheran Symbols. Rev. Brohm, after his visit with the Tennessee Synod, wrote in the *Lutheraner* of June 5, 1855: "In order to heal, if in any way possible, the deplorable breach, the Tennessee Synod, in the course of seven years, made repeated attempts to persuade her opponents [in the North Carolina Synod] to discuss the mooted doctrines, offering them

conditions most just and most acceptable. . . . But with exasperating indifference all these offers were stubbornly despised and rejected. Tennessee directed various questions also to the Pennsylvania Synod in order to learn their views on the pending doctrinal controversies. But this body, too, did not even deign to answer. The Tennessee Synod, however, though rebuffed on all sides and stigmatized as a fanatical sect, quietly went its way, without suffering itself to be confused or led astray. Unanimity and love reigned among its members. The number of congregations which united with them and desired pastors from them constantly increased, so that the Synod was not able to satisfy all requests. The synodical resolutions offer ample evidence of the lively interest and diligence of their pastors to appropriate more and more fully the riches of the Reformation, and to make their congregations partakers thereof." (11, 166.) The first request for a minister came from Cape Girardeau, Mo. The minutes record: "At the earnest request and desire of a number of German inhabitants in Cape Girardeau ("Cape Cheredo"), Mo., through H. Johannes Schmidt and Georg Klemmer, who earnestly pray that they might be visited, it was resolved that H. Jacob Zink should make a journey thither, as soon as possible, to preach the Gospel to them and to perform all other official acts that may be required. For this laudable undertaking we wish him the rich blessing of the Lord." (B. 1820, 10.)

#### OBJECTIONS TO GENERAL SYNOD.

**92. Critique of So-called "Planentwurf."** — The formation of a Lutheran General Synod, warmly advocated by the Synods of Pennsylvania and North Carolina, met with the earnest and zealous, though not in every respect judicious, opposition of the Tennessee Synod. Her Report of 1820 contains a criticism of the *Planentwurf*, which in 1819 had been proposed by the Pennsylvania Synod as a tentative constitution for the projected General Synod. Among the objections enumerated are the following: 1. Whosoever desired to be recognized as a pastor would be compelled to pursue his studies at the proposed seminary of the General Synod. 2. Of those entitled to cast a vote there were two pastors to every lay

delegate. "It would therefore be vain for a lay deputy to make the journey, except he desired the honor of being a servant of two masters." 3. The General Synod arrogated to itself the exclusive right to introduce new books for public worship. 4. Luther's Catechism also was to remain only *until* the Synod would introduce other books. 5. According to the *Planentwurf*, the General Synod could reject all articles of faith or omit them entirely. 6. Neither the Augsburg Confession nor the Bible was designated as the foundation of the General Synod, nor even so much as mentioned in the *Planentwurf*. (52 f.) 7. The General Synod was striving to establish a dominion over all Ministeriums, as appeared from the statement: "Until the permission or approval of the General Synod shall have been formally obtained, no newly established body shall be regarded as a Ministerium, nor shall an ordination conferred by them be considered valid." "Accordingly," they said, "one had as much liberty as the rope permitted." (54 f.; 1822, 10.) 8. The General Synod claimed the right to specify the "ranks universally valid for the ministry." "Catechist," as the Report of 1820 has it, "candidate, dean, and pastor will no longer suffice; who knows but something higher will be required, such as bishop, archbishop, cardinal, or even pope!" 9. Pastors were granted the right to appeal from the decision of their synod to the General Synod. "Accordingly the case of a pastor, be he ever so bad, may drag on for years; and if, owing to extreme distances or other circumstances, the witnesses are not able to attend, he may finally even win it. This provision renders the matter similar to a temporal government, where appeals are commonly made from a lower to a higher court." 10. "One cannot be sure that a spirit desiring as much power as appears to be granted by this *Planentwurf* will be able to rest and not seek further power." 11. No one was able to guarantee that this Lutheran General Synod would not later on unite with the General Synods of the sects to form a National Synod, in which the majority would then determine all articles of faith and all church-customs. 12. Such a National Synod would be able also to change the Constitution of the United States and compel every one to unite with this National Synod, impose taxes, etc. (50 f.) By resolution of Synod the reasons why some pastors in Ohio, influenced in

their action by Paul Henkel, rejected the *Planentwurf* were also appended to the Report of 1820. Among them were: 1. The fear "of falling into the hands of a strong hierarchy" by accepting this *Planentwurf*, since they knew from church history that the Papacy had developed rapidly along similar lines. (64.) 2. The General Synod would soon become English, whereas, according to its ministerial order, the Ohio Synod "must remain a German-speaking ministerium." (65.) 3. Every meeting of the General Synod would mean for them a traveling expense of \$168. 4. As the *Planentwurf* was subject to change, union with the General Synod would be tantamount "to buying the cat in the bag," as the proverb has it." These scruples reveal the fact that the Tennessee Synod viewed the General Synod as a body which was hierarchical in its polity and thoroughly un-Lutheran in its doctrinal position, an opinion well founded, even though the objections advanced are not equally valid.

**93. General Synod's Constitution Criticized.** — The critique of the *Planentwurf* was not devoid of fruit in every respect. Due to the testimony of the Henkels, its hierarchical features were toned down considerably in the constitution finally adopted at Hagerstown, Md., 1820. Thus, *e. g.*, the odious passage regarding the establishment of new ministeriums and the validity of their ordinations was omitted. Still Tennessee was far from being satisfied with the constitution as amended. Moreover, a committee was appointed to draw up their remaining objections, and the report submitted was appended to the minutes of 1821 and printed by order of Synod. It subjects the constitution to a severe examination, and makes a number of important strictures. 1. The first objection was raised against the words of the Preamble: "Whereas Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church, hath not given her any particular prescriptions how church-government should be regulated, she therefore enjoys the privilege in all her departments to make such regulations as may appear best, agreeably to situation and circumstances." While recognizing that Christ has given no prescriptions "for the regulation of some things not essential to the Church," they objected to the sweeping statement of the Preamble whereby the government of the

Church would be left to a majority of votes. Tennessee maintained that Matt. 18, 15 Christ prescribes to the Church how discipline is to be exercised; that 1 Cor. 11, 4—11 sufficient rules with respect to public worship are prescribed; that 1 Tim. 3, 1—3 the grades of ministers are described; that 1 Tim. 5, 19—22 instructions are given how to receive an accusation against an elder; and that 2 Tim. 2, 3—6 Paul shows that ministers should not be entangled with the things of this world. "From these and many more passages that might be quoted, it is evident that Christ and His inspired apostles have given the Church sufficient prescriptions of her government in all her various branches. They are general rules, and yet applicable to every particular case that may occur, so that they are also particular prescriptions. But that the constitution of the General Synod saith, Christ has not left such particular prescriptions, appears a strange, unwarranted, and arbitrary assertion." (14 f.) 2. The second objection asserted that the General Synod was a yoke of commandments of men, hence could not serve the purpose of true peace. According to the constitution the purpose of the General Synod was "the exercise of brotherly love, the furtherance of Christian harmony, and the preservation of the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace." But the Report maintained: "The attempt of the establishment of this General Synod has not produced any brotherly love, nor harmony, nor peace; but on the contrary, divisions, contentions, and confusion. This establishment is nothing but self-invented rules and traditions of men, and such as love Christian liberty cannot suffer themselves to be brought into bondage; hence the confusion. O ye watchmen of Zion, pity and spare the flock!" (17 f.) A "note" added by David Henkel, the "clerk of the committee," explains: "That this institution of General Synod's promotes unity in spirit is contrary to constant experience. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and other churches are governed by General Synods, and have many human rules and regulations; but yet from time to time many disputes and factions have arisen among them, so that they are split into many sects and parties. The Lutheran Church never heretofore was governed by a General Synod, yet she never was divided until this novel system was

introduced. . . . The first Lutheran ministers emigrated from Germany and Sweden. . . . Being few in number, no particular synods were formed for many years; yet they were united. The Augsburg Confession of Faith, containing the principal doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, was their standard of union. It was unalterable; they had no novel system, produced by a majority of votes, to expect. . . . Each of these synods, before the General Constitution was formed, were independent, and not amenable to any superior tribunal, except that of Christ. Differences in local and temporary regulations, the formation of new synods, etc., were not considered as divisions of the Church; their standard of unity was far more noble, and exalted: the pure Scriptural doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of Faith was their meridian sun, which they viewed with united eyes; and anything less, such as local and temporary regulations, never influenced their minds, even to think of divisions. The Church proceeded peaceably, until the unhappy and fatal period of 1819 arrived, when a meeting was called to Baltimore, consisting of some of the Synod of Pennsylvania and an individual from North Carolina, for the purpose of devising a plan for the establishment of the General Synod, etc. (17 f.) Article III, Sec. V, which provided that "the General Synod shall take good care not to burden the consciences of ministers with human traditions," called forth the following comment: "The General Synod shall not burden the consciences of ministers with human traditions, yet at the same time the very institution of the General Synod is nothing but human laws and traditions! How vehemently our Savior upbraided the Pharisees for their human laws and the traditions they imposed upon the common people! By means of human laws and traditions popery was established.—Why are preparations made now again to introduce that horrid beast? How careful individual synods should be not to impose human traditions upon the Church, but to remember that they do not assemble for the purpose of making laws for the Church, but only to devise means to execute those already made by Christ." (B. 1821, 26; R. 1821, 28. 29.) In an additional "note" David Henkel remarks: "The unity of the Lutheran Church doth not consist in any external forms or ceremonies, or government established by men. It is independent of any general head

except Christ. The Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession of Faith points out the true nature of her unity. . . . It is the same as if it had said: the Church of Christ is but one united body, consisting of innumerable members; but what unites them? All believers believe in one invisible Lord, by whom they are governed, for He is their King; they are anointed by the same Holy Ghost, for He is their Comforter and Guide. This is an invisible, godlike union, not discerned by the carnal eye, nor doth it imitate the unity of the kingdom of this world. Christ is its polar star, the Bible its charter, ministers who proclaim sweet words of peace, its heralds, Baptism and the Lord's Supper its seal, bond, token, and security. This union is independent of all human ceremonies, traditions, general synods, or anything of the kind, and has existed ever since the promulgation of the Gospel in all realms and climes. . . . A union which consists of human laws, ceremonies, and discipline may be termed a political union—a union peculiar to civil government of this world. Now, even were it the case that all who call themselves Christians would be united in this manner, it would by no means prove their spiritual unity. For many may conform to one external rule, and yet be divided in heart, for they are not all Israelites that are of Israel. It is evident, because the General Synod is but the invention of men, that they make much more necessary to Christian unity than the pure preaching of the Gospel and the proper administration of the Sacraments, commanded by Christ. Thus, this establishment of the General Synod must be contrary to the Seventh Article of our Confession of Faith. True Christianity is thereby blended with human laws and policy—the true lineaments of popery. . . . If no man is to judge Christians in respect to meat and drink or of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days, who, then, has a right to judge them in respect of forming books for the public use in churches, or in respect of meeting as a synod, without a formal permission, or in respect of performing ordinations? The General Synod have arrogated this right of judging and oppressing Christians in these respects. These are prerogatives they claim, contrary to the doctrines of the apostle." (R. 1821, 28.)

**94. Criticism of Constitution Continued.** — 3. The third objection maintained that the General Synod was Lutheran in name only. Says the Report: "This body, indeed, may call itself Evangelical Lutheran, and yet not be such. The constitution does nowhere say that the Augsburg Confession of Faith, or Luther's Catechism, or the Bible shall be the foundation of doctrine and discipline of the General Synod. It is well known that they always have been the standard of the Lutheran Church. Why does the constitution not once name them?" "Had the framers of this constitution been zealous advocates of Lutheran doctrine, they would have been careful to insert a clause to compel the General Synod always to act according to our standard books. It is an easy thing to prove that some of the founders of this General Synod have openly denied some of the important doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of Faith and of Luther's Catechism." (B. 1821, 18; R. 1821, 19.) 4. The fourth objection was based on the proposed membership of the new body, which, according to Article II, was to consist "of deputies of the different Evangelical Synodical and Ministerial Connections in the United States." Tennessee commented: "This body [General Synod] may consist of deputies from the different evangelical connections. It is not said of the several Evangelical *Lutheran* connections. If this body may consist of the different connections, then it is evident that it may be composed of *all* denominations, such as Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc. These all denominate themselves Evangelical, and are even recognized as such by some who call themselves Lutherans. Thus it is manifest that all denominations who call themselves Evangelical may have seats and votes in this body, forasmuch as there is nothing to prohibit them from it." (R. 1821, 22.) The German version adds the following: "The constitution has opened a door where all manner of sects and parties may creep into the Lutheran Church and extirpate her doctrine." (B. 1821, 20.) These apprehensions of Tennessee were no mere products of their own imagination, for just such a union of all Evangelical denominations Shober and his compeers had been ardently advocating in the North Carolina Synod, especially since 1817. 5. The fifth objection was that the General Synod proposed to curtail the exercise of Christian liberty in regard to ceremonies. Article III, Section II, pro-

vided that no synod or ministry in connection with the General Synod shall publish any new catechism, liturgy, compilation of hymns, or confession of faith "without having first handed a complete copy thereof to the General Synod, and having received their sentiments, or admonitions, or advice." The Tennessee Synod held this to be against the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession and said: "Why shall individual societies be robbed of the liberty to introduce such books as suit them best, when our Confession of Faith grants every person liberty in this case?" (23.) 6. A further objection was raised against this article (III, 2) of the constitution because its language permitted the introduction of a new confession of faith. Tennessee remarked: "An opportunity is here given to introduce a new confession of faith. This appears a conclusive proof that the General Synod do not intend to be governed by the Augsburg Confession of Faith, nor vindicate the Lutheran doctrines contained therein; for if they did, they would not by this clause have given liberty to form other confessions of faith. Perhaps this may be one of the reasons why they have nowhere promised in the constitution that Luther's Catechism, the Augsburg Confession of Faith, nor the Bible should be the guide of their body. They wish to have power to form a new confession; perhaps more popular, and suited to the new-fangled opinions of this present age of infidelity. Were not the men such as Luther, Melanchthon, etc., who formed the Augsburg Confession of Faith, as a testimony against popery and other heresies, godly and enlightened men, and to whose instrumentality we owe our light of the Gospel? Will any of the votaries of the General Synod presume to say that this confession is erroneous, heretical, and wicked? Can they form a better one? If they answer in the affirmative, they are no Lutherans, as they call themselves. If they answer in the negative, why, then, have they not positively specified in the constitution that such should remain the standard of the Church? Why have they given an opportunity to introduce a new confession? It is known that all Lutheran ministers, when they are ordained, are solemnly pledged as by an oath to maintain the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession of Faith. But when there is an opportunity given to propose and introduce other confessions, perhaps the very reverse, what shall become of

all the oaths made at the time of ordination?" (24.) The German Report argues: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church already has, for almost three hundred years, a confession of faith, to wit, the Augsburg Confession. To this confession all Lutheran ministers are pledged by an oath when they are ordained. Since the constitution nowhere states that the Augsburg Confession shall be retained, and other confessions of faith may be proposed, it is apparent that the General Synod has the power to abrogate the Augsburg Confession entirely, and to introduce a new and erroneous confession of faith, and consequently to set aside the oath of ordination." (B. 1821, 22.) 7. A further objection to the General Synod was based on Article III, Section V, which provided, among other things, that the General Synod shall take good care "not to oppress any person on account of differences in opinion." After pointing out that this can only be understood as referring to doctrinal differences, Tennessee made the following arraignment: "What an opportunity is here given to introduce all manner of false doctrines! If no person is to be afflicted in respect to difference in opinion, then no person can be excommunicated for propagating any false or wicked doctrine. One might deny the Holy Trinity, and encourage any system of infidelity, and yet, agreeably to this constitution, no one could be rebuked nor suspended. One might plead this article in defense, and say the General Synod have no right to oppress me for my different opinion." (R. 1821, 30; B. 1821, 25.) The German report concludes as follows: "This is nourishment for the lukewarm spirit, where men are indifferent whether true or false opinions are maintained." (27.) That also these apprehensions were not purely imaginary appears from the fact that two delegates of the Ministerium of New York, then identifying itself with the rationalism of Quitman, were permitted to participate in the organization of the General Synod. 8. Finally, Article III, Section VIII, provided that the General Synod should "be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of opinions among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, may not pass by neglected and unavailing." In this, too, Tennessee saw but "another oppor-

tunity to extirpate the Lutheran doctrine." "For," said they, "how is it possible that the opinions of Lutherans can ever become agreed with those of Calvinists and other parties so long as they do not deny their teachings?" (B. 1821, 30.) The English Report merely states: "All that we can understand from this [Section VIII] is a desire to unite with all denominations." (34.) Thus the Tennessee Synod, with the utmost candor, exposed and rebuked the un-Lutheran features of the constitution of the General Synod, which substituted external organization and union for true internal Christian unity in the Spirit. David Henkel remarked: "Is the General Synod a plant which has been planted by the heavenly Father? No. It was planted by a majority of votes. . . . It is too lamentable a fact that among the most denominations human laws, discipline, and ceremonies are made the rallying point of unity!" (R. 1821, 30; 1832, 17.) It was in the spirit of truth and conscientiousness that Tennessee had made her objections to the constitution of the General Synod. "We conclude," they say, "hoping that the friends of the General Synod will not view us as enemies. We would freely join in with them if we could do it with a good conscience . . .; it is much easier to swim with than against the current." (34.)

#### ATTITUDE AS TO CHURCH-FELLOWSHIP.

**95. Refusing to Join in with General Synod.** — The practise of the Tennessee Synod squared with her doctrinal position. Also church-fellowship was regarded as a matter, not of expediency and policy, but of conscience. In the conclusion to their "Objections against the Constitution of the General Synod" the committee declared: Since a general connection of all ministers in a General Synod would exalt the clerical state to a high degree above the people; since greater burdens might then be imposed on the people, and ministers could thereby live more comfortably; since our widows and orphans also might then live with much ease and our missionary services would be amply remunerated; and since the union with the General Synod would increase our popularity and decrease our burdensome labors, — "we, therefore, would freely join in with them if we could do it with a good conscience," and "if we could

justify such conduct before the judgment throne of Christ." (R. 34; B. 30.) In accordance herewith Tennessee, at her first meeting, resolved: "It cannot be tolerated that a teacher of our conference have any connection with the so-called Central or General Synod, for the reason which will be adduced afterwards." (5.) The minutes of 1826 record: "Whereas there is a report in circulation, both verbally and in print, that some of us, members of the Tennessee Conference, should have said that we now regard the General Synod as a useful institution; that we disapprove the turbulent conduct of a certain member of this body; that we (some of us) pledged ourselves to leave this body if we cannot succeed in having said member expelled, we deem it our duty hereby to inform the public that we are unanimously agreed in viewing the General Synod as an anti-Lutheran institution, and highly disapprove it, and are the longer, the more confirmed in this opinion; and that we know of no member among us whose conduct is turbulent or immoral, and hence have no desire either to expel any one, nor do any of us intend to withdraw from this body. Neither do we know of any member among us who is not legally ordained. We testify that we live in brotherly love and harmony. September 5, 1826." (6.) In 1839 the General Synod publicly denounced the Tennessee Synod, charging her with un-Lutheran as well as unchristian doctrine and conduct. The matter, brought to the attention of Tennessee by a petition from the congregation at New Market and from Coiner's Church, was disposed of by the following resolutions: "1. Resolved, That it is to us a matter of small importance whether the General Synod recognizes us as an Evangelical Lutheran Synod or not, since our orthodoxy and our existence as a Lutheran body in no wise depends on their judgment. 2. Resolved, That we cannot recognize the General Synod as an Evangelical Lutheran body, forasmuch as they have departed from the doctrines and practises of the Lutheran Church. 3. Resolved, That under present circumstances we have no inclination whatsoever to unite with the General Synod, and can never unite with them, except they return once more to the primitive doctrine and usages of the Lutheran Church. 4. Resolved, That Pastor Braun be appointed to draw up our objections to the General Synod,

and to show from its own publications wherein that body has departed from the doctrine and usages of the Lutheran Church, and submit his manuscript to this Synod at its next session for examination; and that, if approved, it be printed." (B. 1841, 11; R. 1842, 8.) In this connection the Tennessee Synod likewise resolved in no wise to take part in the centenary of the Lutherans in America as recommended by the General Synod. (15.) At the next session of Synod the committee reported that they had examined the manuscript submitted by Rev. Braun, and that it was "well calculated to place in their proper light the views and practises of the General Synod and expose its corruptions and departures from Lutheranism, as well as to evince the fact that the Tennessee Synod still retain in their primitive purity the doctrines, and adhere to the usages of the Lutheran Church." (10.) When, in 1853, the Pennsylvania Synod called upon all Lutheran synods to follow their example and unite with the General Synod, Tennessee took cognizance of this matter in the following resolution: "Whereas we regard the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as the authorized and universally acknowledged Symbol of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and consequently the belief and acknowledgment of it, in its entireness, as essential to the existence of Lutheranism in its integrity; and whereas we profess, in our synodical constitution, to believe the doctrines of the Christian system as exhibited in this symbol, and have pledged ourselves to teach according to it; and whereas the doctrinal position of the General Synod, as we understand it, is only a qualified acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession, as we think it evident, a) from the constitution of this body, in which there is no clause binding its members to teach according to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and not even a distinct mention of this instrument; b) from the constitution recommended by the General Synod to the District Synods connected with it; c) from the form of oath required of professors in its Theological Seminary, when inducted into office; d) from the construction placed upon its Constitution by the framer of that instrument, and other prominent members of it; e) from the various publications made by distinguished members of the General Synod, in which distinctive doctrines of our Church confessions are

openly assailed, and for doing which they have never been called to account: be it therefore 1. Resolved, That we cannot, under existing circumstances, take any steps toward a union with the General Synod." (8.)

**96. Attitude toward North Carolina Synod.** — In her relations with the North Carolina Synod the practise of Tennessee was in perfect keeping with her doctrine, her actions tallying with her words. In 1820 they declared: "No teacher of our Conference may take seat and vote in the present Synod of North Carolina, since we cannot look upon them as a truly Evangelical Lutheran synod." (B. 1820, 9.) Neither was it tolerated that a member of the Tennessee Synod at the same time be a member of the North Carolina Synod; witness the case of Seechrist. (R. 1826, 4.) Furthermore, Tennessee declared that steps looking to a union with the North Carolina Synod would be contemplated only if the respective pastors of that synod were to "revoke their doctrine in print as publicly as they had disseminated the same, and would give entire assent to the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession." (1824, 11; 1825, 6.) At the sixth convention, 1825, the committee previously appointed to negotiate with the North Carolina Synod reported that the ministers of that connection had refused to deal with them, 1. Because this "committee did not entitle them as a genuine Lutheran body; and 2. because we appointed farmers to constitute the committee." (6.) With respect to the first grievance Tennessee declared: "We must here observe that we cannot consistently grant to the Synod of North Carolina this title, because we maintain that they departed from the Lutheran doctrine. This is the very design in preferring the questions, in order to ascertain whether they adopted different views, since they published their doctrines. We, therefore, entreat them not to be offended when at this time we cannot grant the desired title, but to be contented until a union with respect to doctrine shall have been effected." (R. 1825, 6.) Thus Tennessee was careful to avoid even the appearance of denying her convictions. Dissimulation was not in her nature. True to her convictions she formulated the address of her second petition for negotiations as follows: "To the Rev. Synod of North Carolina, *who assume the title Lu-*

*theran*, but which we, at this time, for the reason aforesaid, dispute. Well-beloved in the Lord, according to your persons," etc. (R. 1825, 6.) Similar language was employed in the invitation of December, 1826, which the Tennessee committee (Daniel Moser and David Henkel) sent to Pastors Stork, Shober, Sherer, and other pastors of the North Carolina Synod to conduct a public debate, that every one might be enabled to decide for himself "who are the genuine and who the spurious Lutherans." The invitation reveals a spirit of love, fairness, and willingness to yield in every point which was not a matter of conscience, as well as true Lutheran conscientiousness and determination not to yield a single point in violation of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Symbols. Here Daniel Moser and David Henkel who wrote the letter of invitation state with true Christian frankness: "You call yourselves Lutherans, and we call ourselves the same; notwithstanding there is a division. You have accused us with teaching erroneous doctrines, and we, notwithstanding the appellation you give yourselves, deny that your doctrines correspond with the same or with the Holy Scriptures." (27.) "We are willing to forgive all private conduct which we conceive erroneous and criminal in you. You ought also to be willing to forgive what you conceive to be the same in us. But as we differ with you in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, an ecclesiastical union is impracticable, until the one or the other party be clearly refuted and convinced." (29.) The following were mentioned as the chief points of difference which ought to be discussed: "1. The person and incarnation of Christ, etc. 2. Justification. 3. Repentance. 4. Good Works. 5. Holy Baptism. 6. The Lord's Supper. 7. Church Government." (R. 1827, 26.) An offer of union made by the North Carolina Synod, in 1847, was answered by Tennessee as follows: "Resolved, That we accede to a union with the said Synod only on the platform of pure and unadulterated Evangelical Lutheranism — a union which we shall heartily rejoice to form, as is evident from the repeated overtures we made to bring about such a desirable state of things." (R. 1847, 9.)

**97. Attitude toward Other Southern Synods.** — Tennessee was conscious of representing nothing but the pure

truth of unadulterated Lutheranism also over against the Synods of South Carolina, Virginia, and South West Virginia. Despite enmity, contempt, and slander, they were unwilling to enter into any unionistic compromise at the expense of the truth as they saw it. As for the Synod of South Carolina (organized 1824), the Tennessee Report of 1838 recorded the following protest: "Whereas the Synod of South Carolina has recently employed various scandalous means in order to bring the Ev. Luth. Tennessee Synod into disrepute, in particular by the annotations contained in a sermon delivered by Pastor Johannes Bachman, D. D., which was published with the approval and by the support of said Synod (the aforementioned sermon, unless its evil influence is hindered, is well calculated to make a false and unfavorable impression upon otherwise honest minds, and to represent our doctrine, synod, and pastors as being the objects of scorn, disdain, and constant persecution); and whereas we believe that we stand on the primitive ground of the Lutheran Church, and that the doctrine of the glorious and memorable Reformation, which was wrought through the especial mediation of the Saxon Reformers, Dr. Martin Luther and his immortal assistants, exactly agrees with the Word of God, which we regard as the only infallible norm of faith and life: 1. therefore be it Resolved, That we regard the actions of the South Carolina Synod toward us as impolite, ignoble, dishonest, and uncharitable. 2. Resolved, That we look upon the assertions in Dr. Bachman's sermon as utterly unfounded and without the slightest approach to the truth, but as base calumniations, well calculated to insult (beschimpfen) our Synod." At the same time Pastors Braun and Miller were appointed a committee to publish a refutation of Bachman's sermon. (B. 1838, 11.) In his address delivered on November 12, 1837, Bachman, as President of the South Carolina Synod, had voiced, with a squint toward Tennessee, among others, the following sentiments: "We have never boasted of being an exclusive church, whose doctrines are more Scriptural or whose confessors are purer than those of other denominations round about us. . . . We will gladly unite with every friend of the Gospel in producing the downfall of sectarianism, though not the obliteration of sects. Our pulpits

have ever been open to the servants of every Christian communion, and we invite to our communion tables the followers of Jesus regardless of what particular denomination they may belong to." Dr. Bachman, in direct contravention to what the Henkels had maintained over against Stork and Shoer of the North Carolina Synod, expressed his own indifferentistic and Reformed doctrinal position as follows: "If Baptism is regeneration, why, then, does not every one who has been baptized in infancy walk with God from his Baptism? Why does not every one lead a pious life? Evidently, such is not the case!" "As a matter of fact, for a hundred years the Lutheran Church has abandoned the moot question of the body of Christ, etc., and has left it to the consciences of its members to decide what they must believe according to Holy Writ. This we may do without deviating from the faith of our Church, since at our ordination, especially in this country, we confess nothing more than that the fundamental articles of the divine Word are, in a manner substantially correct, presented in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession." (*Kirchl. Mitt.* 1846, 34 f.) In the same year (1838) the Tennessee Synod instructed its secretary to inquire of the president of the Virginia Synod (organized 1829 at Woodstock) why, according to the resolution passed at their last meeting, they do "not recognize the members of the Tennessee Conference as Evangelical Lutheran pastors." (B. 1838 12.) And, when, in 1848, the Western Virginia Synod (Southwest Virginia Synod, organized 1841) requested an exchange of delegates, Tennessee answered: "Resolved, That, although it would afford us the highest gratification, and we most sincerely desire to see those who are one with us in name also united in doctrine and practise, and in that case would most cheerfully unite and cooperate with them in such measures as are calculated to advance and promote the cause of truth, yet we wish it to be distinctly understood that, however much a union is desired, it can only be effected upon the assurance of a strict adherence to the doctrines and usages of our Church as set forth in its Symbols; and until we can have this assurance, we, on our part, can consent to no such union." (R. 1848, 8.)

## EFFORTS AT UNITY AND PEACE.

**98. Attempts at Union with North Carolina.** — Though universally decried as the “Quarreling Conference,” Tennessee enjoyed and cultivated unity and harmony within, and zealously also sought peace and unity with other Lutheran synods. In 1826 all of the Tennessee ministers signed a document, denying a report circulated by their enemies, according to which Tennessee was disagreed as to its attitude toward the General Synod, and declaring: “We testify that we live in brotherly love and harmony.” The minutes add: “Thus it is evident that all the ministers of this body live in brotherly love, and entertain uniform sentiments.” (7.) Nor did the staunch, unbending doctrinal position of Tennessee prove to be a hindrance of, and a check upon, their efforts at unity and peace, but rather a spur to most earnest endeavors in this direction. Moreover, after having themselves fully realized that the Lutheran Confessions contain nothing but God’s eternal truth over against the manifest errors of the Roman and other churches, it was, as shown above, the ambition and prayer of the Henkels to lead the American Lutheran synods out of the mire of sectarian aberrations back to the unadulterated Lutheranism of Luther and the Lutheran Symbols. When, in 1824, some members of the North Carolina Synod made proposals for a union of the two synods, Tennessee forthwith appointed a committee to negotiate with them. (10.) This committee was instructed to compile the controverted points of doctrine from the writings of the two parties, “and to put into one column what the ministers of the North Carolina Synod teach, and in an adjoining column what the Tennessee Synod teaches, so that every one may immediately perceive the difference.” In this way they hoped to enable every one to decide for himself which party taught according to the Augsburg Confession. In the interest of truth the committee was also authorized to direct such questions to the North Carolina Synod as they might see fit. (11.) It was, however, resolved that any further arrangements for union were not to be made until “said pastors, in case they would be convinced, recall their doctrine in print as publicly as they had disseminated it, and fully assent to the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession

and to Lutheran order as it obtained before the institution of the General Synod arose." (11.) Following are the questions which were directed "to the Messrs. C. Stork, G. Shober, Jacob Sherer, Daniel Sherer, Jacob Miller, Martin Walter, and to all other men belonging to this connection" (North Carolina Synod): "1. Do ye intend for the future to maintain what you have asserted, *viz.*: 'Baptized or not baptized, faith saves us?' Or upon mature deliberation, have ye concluded publicly to revoke the same as erroneous? 2. Will ye also maintain that the Christian Church may consist of twenty different opinions? 3. Do ye deny that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper, and administered and received under the external signs of bread and wine? and that also the unbelieving communicants do eat and drink His body and blood? Further, do ye deny that Jesus Christ, agreeably to both natures, as God and man, inseparably connected in one person, is omnipresent, and thus an object of supreme worship? 4. Do ye intend to relinquish the General Synod, if in case ye cannot prove the same to be founded in the Holy Scriptures?" (R. 1825, 8; B. 1824, Appendix, 2.) However, the Carolina Synod declined to answer. The Tennessee committee reported 1825: "The ministers of said connection [Carolina Synod] refused to answer the committee that was appointed last year to negotiate with them. The reasons of their refusal shall here be inserted: Said ministers assign the following reasons which we learn from Mr. J. Sherer's letter and their minutes: 1. That the committee did not entitle them as a genuine Lutheran body; and 2. because we appointed farmers to constitute the committee." (R. 1825, 6.) David Henkel wrote in 1827: "In the year 1822 I addressed a letter to them [North Carolina Synod]. . . . But they refused to accept the letter because they got offended with the address which was, 'The Lutheran Synod of North Carolina and adjoining States, *so called*.' The Tennessee Synod have since, at several of their sessions, made sundry propositions to them for a reciprocal trial, and have proposed some questions to them which they were requested to answer. But as they were not addressed in such manner as to recognize them as genuine Lutherans, they rejected every proposition. It must, however, be observed that they were not thus addressed through contempt, but rather through necessity. One of the

charges against them is that they deviated from the Lutheran doctrines; hence had we addressed them in such manner as to have recognized them as genuine Lutherans, they might easily have justified themselves under the covert of the address, and have produced it as an evidence against our charge." (R. 1827, 35.) However, though North Carolina had not even answered their letter, Tennessee did not relinquish her efforts at peace and harmony. In the following year, 1825, a memorial subscribed by nine persons was submitted, requesting Synod "to make another attempt to effect a union with the ministers of the North Carolina Synod; yet so that the genuine Lutheran doctrine be not thereby suppressed." (R. 1825, 6.) Pursuant to this request, "it was resolved that the questions again should be preferred in a friendly manner; and provided their answer should prove satisfactory, all the necessary regulations shall be made to effect peace and harmony." (7.) At the same time Tennessee explained and justified their action of withholding from the North Carolina Synod the title Lutheran, and of appointing laymen, "farmers," as they were styled by North Carolina, to constitute the committee. "It was believed," David Henkel declared with respect to the latter point, "laymen would act more impartially, since the ministers are more immediately concerned in this controversy. Neither can I discover that all the farmers are so contemptible a class of people that Mr. Sherer could possibly be offended at the appointment!" (R. 1825, 7.) Regarding the first point Synod declared: "We must here observe that we cannot consistently grant to the Synod of North Carolina this title [Lutheran], because we maintain that they departed from the Lutheran doctrine. . . . We therefore entreat them not to be offended when at this time we cannot grant the desired title, but to be contented until a union with respect to doctrine shall have been effected." (R. 1825, 7.) In accordance herewith the letter to the North Carolina Synod was addressed as follows: "To the Rev. Synod of North Carolina who assume the title Lutheran; but which we at this time, for the reason aforesaid, dispute. Well-beloved in the Lord, according to your persons!" (R. 1825, 7.)

**99. Debates at Organ and St. Paul's Churches.** — According to her resolutions of 1825, Tennessee was ready to

establish peace and harmony with the North Carolina Synod. But one proviso had been added by Tennessee, limiting this action as follows: "Provided their [North Carolina's] answer should prove satisfactory." If such, however, should not be the case, they proposed public discussions of the differences. The minutes continue: "But if in case their answers should not prove satisfactory, that we propose to them to appoint a certain time and place, and that each party appoint a speaker, for the purpose of exhibiting the disputed doctrines, so that the assembly, which may be present, may discover the difference; and that also all the arguments, on both sides, may afterwards be published." (R. 1825, 7.) In the following year, when the questions preferred were still unanswered by North Carolina, Tennessee resolved: "This Synod have made sundry proposals to the North Carolina connection for the purpose of amicably adjusting the difference which exists with respect to doctrine and other differences, but said connection have hitherto refused to comply with any of the proposals. Although it seems to be in vain to make any further propositions, yet this Synod deem it their duty to adopt the following resolutions: 1. That the Revs. Adam Miller, Daniel Moser, and David Henkel be authorized to proclaim and hold a public meeting at or near the Organ Church, Rowan Co., N. C. They shall continue said meeting at least three days, and preach on the disputed points of doctrine. 2. That they invite the Revs. C. A. Stork and Daniel Sherer, who reside near said Organ Church, to attend said meeting, and give them an opportunity of alleging their objections and proving their doctrines. Further, that as many of the other ministers belonging to the North Carolina connection as may be conveniently notified be also invited to attend for the same purpose. This will afford an opportunity to a number of people to ascertain which party have deviated from the Lutheran doctrine. This meeting shall, if God permit, commence on the 4th day of next November." (R. 1826, 5.) The public meeting was duly proclaimed at Organ Church in Rowan Co., N. C., on the 4th of November. A notice was inserted into the weekly paper, and some of the ministers were individually requested to attend. However, not one of the North Carolina Synod ministers put

in his appearance, or made any official statement of their reasons for not attending. Persons who had visited Rev. Stork quoted him as having said: "Let them [the committee] come to our Synod, which is the proper place to discuss these points." (R. 1827, 5.) Stork's remark suggested the arrangement of a second debate in connection with the prospective meeting of the North Carolina Synod in St. Paul's Church, Lincoln Co., beginning May 7, 1827. The Tennessee Report of 1827 records: "On the day appointed [November 4, 1826], Messrs. Moser and Henkel attended [the meeting at the Organ Church]; but none of the ministers whom they had invited. Whereupon sundry respectable members of the Lutheran community [in Lincoln Co.] requested the committee [of the Tennessee Synod, Moser and Henkel] to renew this invitation, and to make another appointment. The same request was also made by the Lutheran Joint Committee of this county [composed of members of several Lutheran congregations in Lincoln County], at their session on the 9th of last December [1826]. Accordingly, Messrs. Moser and Henkel renewed the invitation, and proclaimed another meeting." (25.) The request of the Lutheran Joint Committee reads as follows: "To Lutherans. The Lutheran Tennessee Synod had appointed a committee for the purpose of publicly debating some points of doctrine, which are in dispute between the aforesaid Synod, and that which is commonly called the Synod of North Carolina and adjoining States. Some members of the latter were invited and notified by the committee to attend at Organ Church, on the 4th ult., for the purpose of reciprocally discussing the aforesaid points of doctrine. Two of the committee attended, but none of the ministers of the North Carolina Synod. Whatever reasons they may have had for not attending, we, the members of several Lutheran congregations in this county, being assembled and constituting a joint committee for the purpose of regulating the internal government of the same, request said committee to proclaim another public meeting at a convenient place for the aforesaid purpose, and to invite the members of the North Carolina Synod to attend the same. We also hereby request the members of the North Carolina Synod to meet the committee [of Tennessee] in a friendly manner, in order to discuss the doctrines in dispute." Moser and Henkel responded: "We . . .

acquiesce in your request, and deem it pertinent to the manifestation of the truth." (26.) They also published a proclamation, inviting the ministers of the North Carolina Synod to attend a public meeting to be held in St. Paul's Church, Lincoln Co., "to commence on the day after you shall have adjourned, and to continue at least three days." (R. 1827, 27.) Again invitations and notices of the projected meeting were printed, and a copy was sent to each of the ministers of the North Carolina Synod a few months prior to their session. And when the North Carolina Synod was convened, by special messenger, a letter was sent to the president for presentation to Synod, inviting them to attend the proposed debate, at the same time asking them to give their reasons in case they should refuse to comply with the request. On the following day the messenger, Mr. Rudisill, applied for an answer, and again on the day of adjournment; but in vain. The Report of 1827 records: "Mr. Rudisill handed this letter to the president, who, taking it, replied that it was not properly directed to them; notwithstanding it should be given to a committee appointed by this Synod, who should report on the same. On the next day Mr. Rudisill applied for an answer, but he received none. On Wednesday, the day of their adjournment, Mr. Rudisill again requested an answer, but he again received none. Neither did the Synod assign any reason for their refusal. Whereupon Mr. Rudisill publicly proclaimed that Messrs. Moser and Henkel would attend on the next day, *i. e.*, on Thursday, and discourse upon these disputed topics, and invited all who were present to attend. Accordingly, Messrs. Moser and Henkel attended, but none of the ministerium of the North Carolina Synod appeared. The most of them, or perhaps all, had started on their way home. The members of the church who were present requested David Henkel to discourse on a few of those disputed points, with which he complied. After his discourse was ended, it was concluded that it was not necessary then to pursue the subject any further. The congregation, who were present, nominated a majority of the members of this committee to draw up the above statements. It was resolved that this report shall be laid before the next session of the Tennessee Synod and that the same shall be requested to annex it to the report of their transactions. It was further resolved that

David Henkel be requested to write a treatise, in order to show the propriety and Scriptural grounds for the debate on the disputed points of doctrine, which was offered to the ministers of the North Carolina Synod." (R. 1827, 31 f.) Thus the repeated and cordial offers on the part of the Tennessee Synod to discuss and settle the differences were ignored and spurned by the North Carolina Synod. David Henkel wrote: "As the committee, who gave them the last invitation to attend to public debate, knew from past experience that to address the North Carolina Synod with the addition 'so called' was offensive, and was made a plea to evade a public trial, they addressed some of the principal ministers thereof agreeably to etiquette, by their personal names, and including all the others, believing that no rational man would be offended to be called by his own name. Neither did I hear that any of them objected to the address as offensive, nor to any of the propositions for the manner of conducting the debate. Notwithstanding this, and although they accepted a letter directed to them also by the committee, and promised the bearer to return an answer, yet they treated both the invitation and letter with silent contempt." (35.) The repeated endeavors of the Tennessee Synod to draw the false Lutherans out of their holes failed. The Lutheran Church of America was destined to sink even deeper into the mire of indifferentism, unionism, and sectarianism.

**100. Characteristic Address of Moser and Henkel.**—The truly Lutheran spirit in which Tennessee endeavored to bring about unity and peace with the North Carolina Synod appears from the following letter, published in connection with the debates proposed in the interest of union, and dated, "Lincoln Co., N. C., December 10, 1826": "To the Revs. Charles A. Stork, G. Shober, Jacob Sherer, and Daniel Sherer, and all other ministers belonging to their Synod. — Sirs! You call yourselves Lutherans, and we call ourselves the same; notwithstanding there is a division. You have accused us of teaching erroneous doctrines, and we, notwithstanding the appellation you give yourselves, deny that your doctrines correspond with the same or with the Holy Scriptures. It is hence somewhat difficult for some professors of Lutheranism

to determine with which party to associate, as they have not sufficient information on the subject. We know no method which would be better calculated to afford the people information and an opportunity for both parties to prove their accusations than to meet each other, and debate the points in dispute publicly, according to the rules of decorum. — Whereas we are informed that you intend to hold your next synod in St. Paul's Church in this county, on the first Sunday in next May, why we wish to try your doctrines, and why we wish you to try ours by the Augustan Confession and the aforesaid symbolical books, is because the important question in the dispute is, Who are the genuine and who the spurious Lutherans? For it is known that Lutheran ministers are pledged to maintain the Augustan Confession. But if you should at said meeting declare that the Augustan Confession contains false doctrine, and that Dr. Luther erred in any of the doctrines which are here proposed for discussion, we shall then, in that case, be willing to appeal exclusively to the Holy Scriptures. — Whatever private misunderstanding may have existed between us heretofore, we notwithstanding intend to meet you in a friendly manner, without attempting to wound your feelings by personal reflections. That we intend publicly to contradict your doctrines as erroneous we beg you not to consider as an insult, as we expect and are willing for you to treat ours in the same manner. We pray you as our former brethren, do not despise and reject those proposals, as a compliance with them may have the salutary effect to convince either the one or the other party of the truth, and we are confident it will be beneficial to many of the hearers. — We are willing to forgive all private conduct which we conceive erroneous and criminal in you. You ought also to be willing to forgive what you consider the same in us. But as we differ with you in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, an ecclesiastical union is impracticable until the one or the other party be clearly refuted and convinced. — We remain yours, respectfully, Daniel Moser. David Henkel." (R. 1827, 27.)

**101. Probing Orthodoxy of Pennsylvania Synod.** — In the interest of doctrinal clarity and Christian unity the Tennessee Synod, in 1823, addressed to the Pennsylvania Synod the

following questions: "1. Do ye believe that Holy Baptism performed with water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, effects remission for sins, delivers from death and Satan, and gives admittance into everlasting life to all such as believe, according to God's promises? 2. Do ye believe that the true body and blood of Christ are present, administered, and received under the external signs of bread and wine? Do ye believe that the unbelieving communicants also eat and drink the body and blood of Christ? We do not ask whether they receive remission for their sins, but simply, whether they also eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. 3. Ought Jesus Christ to be worshiped as true God and man in one person? 4. Ought the Evangelic Lutheran Church, endeavor to be united with any religious denomination, whose doctrines are contrary to the Augustan Confession of faith? Or, is it proper for Lutherans to commune with such?" (R. 1825, 9.) The Pennsylvania Synod, which immediately prior to that time had been planning to establish a union seminary with the German Reformed and to enter into organic union with that body, treated the request with silent contempt. Two years later Tennessee, patiently and humbly, renewed the questions with the following preamble: "In the year of our Lord 1823, a few questions were preferred to your honorable body by this Synod, but as no answers have been received, and as the reasons thereof are not known, we [Daniel Moser, Ambrose Henkel, John Ramsauer, Peter Hoyle] were appointed by our Synod to renew the request, and to solicit you to comply with the same. We most humbly beseech you to make known the reasons of your hope that is in you, because we believe if this be done, it will contribute towards restoring peace and tranquillity among all genuine Lutherans. We, therefore, renew the following questions," etc. (R. 1825, 8 f.) "It was also resolved," the Report of 1825 continues, "that the Secretary of this Synod be ordered to address a friendly letter to the Rev. Muhlenberg, member of the Synod of Pennsylvania, for the purpose of obtaining his counsel relative to the present affairs of the Church." (9.) However, these letters also remained unanswered. But, even this did not exasperate, nor exhaust the patience of, Tennessee, as appears from the following entry in the minutes of 1826: "At our last session a few theological questions were submitted

to the reverend Synod of East Pennsylvania, and a letter to the Rev. Muhlenberg; but we received no answer, neither from the Synod nor from Mr. Muhlenberg. The cause of this delay we do not know; but we indulge the hope of receiving satisfactory answers before our next session." (R. 1826, 6.) In the same Report we read: "Several letters from Pennsylvania [not the Synod] were read in which David Henkel is particularly requested to visit that State for the purpose of preaching, and arguing the peculiar doctrines of the Lutheran Church. Resolved, That this Synod also solicit him to undertake this task. He agreed to do so, provided he can arrange his other business so as to be enabled." (9.) In the following year, however, as no answer had arrived from the Pennsylvania Synod, Tennessee made the following declaration, which was directed also against the North Carolina Synod: "Whereas there are sundry ministers who appear under the disguise of Lutherans, notwithstanding [they] deny the Lutheran doctrines, and as they are patronized by several synods, this body deemed it expedient and to have a Scriptural privilege to demand of other bodies answers to some theological questions, in order to ascertain whether they differ in points of doctrine from this body. Accordingly, they submitted a few theological questions to the reverend Synod of Pennsylvania (now East Pennsylvania), and have waited patiently four years for an answer. But no answer was received. The secretary was also ordered by the session of 1825 to address a friendly letter on the subject to the Rev. Muhlenberg. The secretary complied with this order; but Mr. Muhlenberg has not as yet returned an answer. In order, therefore, to ascertain the sentiments of the several synods, as well as of individual ministers on sundry points of doctrine, it was resolved, 1. That there shall be a pastoral address directed to the Lutheran community, in which shall be shown what this body deem to be the genuine Lutheran doctrines relative to such points as are in dispute. 2. That the several Synods, as well as individual ministers shall be requested, in the preface of the aforesaid contemplated address, to peruse and examine it; and then, in a formal manner, either justify it as correct, or condemn it as erroneous. That every synod and minister who shall be silent after having had an opportunity of perusing it shall be considered as fully sanc-

tioning all its contents as correct, although they should teach or patronize a contrary doctrine. 3. That David Henkel shall compile and prepare said book for publication, and that the other ministers of this body shall assist him in it. . . . This address is intended to be published both in the German and English languages." (R. 1827, 6 f.) Also from the Ohio Synod, which at that time practically identified itself with the indifferentistic attitude of the Pennsylvania Synod, Tennessee received but little encouragement in her efforts at purifying the Lutheran Church from the leaven of sectarianism. Says Sheatsley: "The minutes [of the Ohio Synod of 1825] report that David Henkel of the Tennessee Synod placed several theological questions before Synod. These were discussed in the ministerial meeting and answered, but as many of the older heads were absent, the answers should first be sent to them and then forwarded to Pastor Henkel. What the questions were we have no means of determining [no doubt, they were the same questions asked the Pennsylvania Synod], but, judging from the ability and bent of the doughty David Henkel, we may surmise that the questions involved some difficulties. In the following year Synod resolved that it could not answer these questions, since it is not our purpose at our meetings to discuss theological questions, but to consider the general welfare of the Church. This did not betoken indifference [?] to doctrine, but it was then like it is now a Joint Synod; there was little or no time for the discussion of these matters." (*History*, 73.)

#### TENNESSEE JUSTIFYING HER PROCEDURE.

**102. Confession of Truth a Christian Duty.** — It appears from the procedure of the Tennessee Synod, as well as from the resolution of 1827, quoted in the preceding paragraph, that Tennessee felt justified in demanding a show-down on the part of the American Lutheran synods, which had persistently refused to reveal their colors. However, being unionists, indifferentists, and masked or open Calvinists, these false Lutherans resented such a demand as obtrusive, arrogant, and impudent. Hence their contemptuous silence. However, also in this matter Tennessee realized that they were only asking what, according to the Word of God, it was their solemn duty

to demand. For to confess the faith which is in him is not only the privilege of a Christian, but also an obligation and a debt which he owes his brethren. Accordingly, when, in 1827, the committee reported how all efforts to induce the Carolina and Pennsylvania Synods to reveal their colors and to give testimony of their faith as to the doctrines of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc., had been rebuked with silent contempt, Tennessee passed the resolutions quoted in the preceding paragraph. They felt called upon publicly to justify their procedure; and this all the more so because a member of the North Carolina Synod had declared "that it was not only improper, but also sinful to argue publicly on religious subjects." (R. 1827, 36.) David Henkel, therefore, in a treatise appended to the Report of 1827, endeavored to show the propriety and the Scriptural grounds for the public debate proposed to the ministers of the North Carolina Synod. How Tennessee justified her actions appears from the following quotations culled from this treatise: "The members of the Lutheran Church," says David Henkel, "are pledged by their confirmation vows to support and to adhere to her doctrines and discipline. Now as it is not a matter of little importance to break such vows, it is therefore highly interesting for every member to know who of the ministers and which of the synods have departed from the confession of faith they have vowed to maintain, as a connection with such would be a partaking of their errors." (33.) "Because all Lutherans are pledged to maintain the doctrines of their confession of faith, it may therefore be legally required of any one to stand an examination, if it be believed that he has deviated from the same." (36.) "The members of the Lutheran Church at the time of their confirmation declare that they believe the doctrines as held by the same, and every minister is solemnly pledged to maintain the Augustan Confession. Independently of Synods, the Augustan Confession of Faith is the point of union of all Lutherans, and by which they are distinguished from other denominations. As all bear the same name, and are pledged to maintain the same creed, they are viewed as one body. Therefore one member is accountable to another, and it is one minister's duty to watch the other's official conduct, as the doctrines taught by one are ascribed to the others, because

they constitute one body. How does a man become partaker of another's guilt but by being in connection with him, and not reprobating it? 1 Tim. 5, 22." (37.) "Now as one Lutheran minister's doctrine is ascribed to another, why should the one not have the right to bring the other to an account, provided he believes that he deviates from the confession they are both pledged to maintain? The ministers of the North Carolina Synod call themselves Lutherans, but as we believe that they propagate doctrines contrary to the Augustan Confession, we considered it necessary to require of them to stand an examination. It is necessary to correct a wrong opinion, which is, that Lutheran ministers are at liberty to deviate from the Augustan Confession whereinsoever they conceive it as erroneous. Some ministers have declared that they did not care what the Augustan Confession teaches, that they simply taught the doctrines of the Scriptures; further, that Luther was only a man, and was therefore liable to err. In answer to this, I observe that Lutheran ministers have no right to deviate from any article of this Confession because the whole of it is viewed by the Lutheran community as true and Scriptural. Let them remember their solemn vows! Such as think proper to deviate, infringe upon the rights of the community. It must, however, be admitted that if any one should discover that this confession is unscriptural, he would be justifiable in renouncing it. By doing so no one would be deceived. If there are errors in this confession, why should any man who has discovered them yet pretend to preach under its covert? Such as believe that this Confession contains errors practise a twofold fraud. The one is, that they cause Lutherans to think that they hold the same doctrines as they do themselves, when yet they do not. The other is (provided it be true what they affirm), that they encourage the people in those errors, because they pretend to support the very confession which contains them. That the Bible is the proper rule of doctrine must be confessed; yet the question is, Does the Augustan Confession contradict it? That Luther was a man, and therefore liable to err, is not denied; but that he did err with regard to the doctrines contained in the Augustan Confession remains to be proven. But if he erred, why do such as believe this call them-

selves Lutherans? Such practise a fraud by being called Lutherans, when they affirm that Luther taught erroneous doctrines; or else [they] must own that, by being called after him, they sanction such errors." (37 f.)

**103. Truth Always Seeks the Light.** — In his justification of the procedure of the Tennessee Synod, David Henkel continues as follows: "The intention of the public debate which was offered to the ministers of the North Carolina Synod was to afford them an opportunity of manifesting the doctrines we teach, and to prove them as erroneous. The same [opportunity] we would also had to have treated theirs in like manner. The propositions which were made were calculated to have brought all these things to light. They would not only have offered the hearers who might have been present the opportunity of knowing the difference, and arguments on each side, but the debates might also have been committed to paper and published, and thus the whole Lutheran community might have been judges in this controversy. When a doctrine is in dispute between two parties, how shall the public decide when they never heard the opposite arguments? Is it rational to condemn either party without a trial? Whilst the deeds of men are to be concealed, there are just grounds for believing that they are evil. Our blessed Savior says, 'For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.' John 3, 20. 21. No man who is confident that he has the truth on his side will ever evade coming to the light; for he is not ashamed to profess and vindicate the truth; and though it should be scrutinized to the utmost, yet he knows that thereby, like gold passing through the fire, it shall become more brilliant. Even the man who is diffident with respect to his doctrines, yet having an honest disposition, never objects to be brought to the light; for he considers that no greater favor could be shown him than that his errors be overthrown, and he be led into the paths of truth. But the man who knows that he cannot defend his doctrines upon Scriptural grounds, and yet possesses too high an estimation of himself, hates to be brought to the light, for

he knows that his errors will be unmasked; 'for every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.' Why do men make so many shifts to evade a public trial of the doctrines, but a consciousness of being in an error which their pride does not suffer to be publicly exposed? Many a man in a hasty ill humor condemns a doctrine merely because the man whom he considers his enemy vindicates it; and though he should afterwards be clearly convinced, yet he believes it to be beneath his dignity to make a recantation, and thus throughout all his days he is tormented with a guilty conscience. In the days of the Reformation public debates were highly conducive to manifest the errors of the papists. When Luther confronted his opponents in the presence of multitudes, it was that many souls got convinced of the truth, which before were kept in ignorance. Had he refused to appear, especially before the Diet at Worms, what would have been the result? Though he knew that his life was in danger, if he appeared, yet he also knew that the cause he had espoused would have suffered, provided he evaded a public test of his doctrines. The Papists having been taught by experience that the public debates with Luther proved injurious to their party, they avoided them as much as they could and employed various stratagems to destroy him and his cause. Luther says: 'The court of Rome most horribly fears, and shamefully flees from, a Christian council.' Had this principle been uniformly followed in the days of Luther that it is sinful to dispute on points of doctrine, the errors of the Papish Church could have been impregnable; and those who bear the name of Christian might perhaps yet groan under papal superstition and tyranny. . . . Thousands have joined churches with whose peculiar doctrines they are not acquainted, and even do not know whether their government is republican, aristocratical, or monarchical. They are satisfied with what they hear from their ministers, without even examining their creeds or forms of government. Such being ignorant, they are already prepared for a state of slavery. They who so easily submit to an ecclesiastical slavery may also by degrees, by the same means, be led to sacrifice their civil liberty. How is it possible that people can with any degree of safety be in con-

nection with such ministers as are publicly impeached with erroneous doctrines, and yet are not willing to be brought to light? Ought not every person conclude: If such ministers believed that they had nothing but the truth on their side, they would freely embrace every opportunity of coming to the light, so that they might show that their works are wrought in God, and refute their opponents' calumnies? That a public debate would create animosity is no reason that it should be omitted. Would it offend real Christians? By no means. It indeed might offend false teachers and their votaries, who for the want of argument would substitute the ebullitions of their anger. But what Christian can imagine that no error should be exposed, lest the persons who are guilty might be offended?" (38 ff.)

**104. Arguments Continued.** — David Henkel furthermore showed from Phil. 2, 15; 1 Pet. 2, 9; 1 Pet. 3, 15. 16, that it is the duty of Christians to shine as lights in the world, to instruct the ignorant, to give an answer to every man who asks them a reason of the hope that is in them, and then proceeds to the following conclusion: "Now if it be every Christian's duty to answer those who interrogate them respecting the grounds of their faith, how contrary to the Word of God do such synods and ministers act when they refuse answering some important theological questions either by writing or public interview! Do they refuse because they consider the persons who interrogate them too far beneath their notice? Does not this (if it be the case) indicate that they are possessed with the pride of the devil? What! poor sinful mortals, do they exalt themselves above their fellow-men? Or are they ashamed to let their sentiments be known? Are they sensible that they cannot rationally defend their doctrines if they were scrutinized? Or, indeed, have they the truth on their side, and yet fear to let it be known that they believe it, lest they should become unpopular? Alas! there are too many whose sentiments may be correct, yet through fear of getting the ill will of some others will not answer the most important questions. Let such men remember, that, whilst they wish to keep the truth in darkness, with a view to please opposite parties, that they are vile hypocrites; and let them tremble! St. Paul

says: 'For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.' Gal. 1, 10. We have asked the ministers of the North Carolina Synod for the reasons of the hope that is in them, or properly, for the proofs of their doctrines; and, agreeably to the last invitation given them, they might have had the opportunity of showing the reasonableness of their doctrines. Now as they have neglected to endeavor to convince us, why do they warn the people against us, especially since they are not willing to confront us in a public debate?" (42 f.) Henkel continues: "We, as it has been already said, are represented by the ministers of the North Carolina Synod as enemies of the promulgation of the Gospel. Particularly I am charged with teaching the most dangerous heresies, as may be seen from a scurrilous pamphlet written by their president, Mr. Shober. How is such a dangerous man to be treated by Christian pastors? Is he to be at liberty without reproof? Is he to be opposed behind his back, and defeated by arguments, or rather invectives, to which he has no opportunity of replying? No. For such treatment has rather a tendency to strengthen him in his errors, and cause such as are led by him to conclude that his doctrines are incontestable; otherwise the learned and pious clergy would confront him in a public interview. St. Paul describes the duty of a bishop in this respect: that he should 'hold fast the faithful Word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.' He adds: 'For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouth must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.' Titus 1, 9. 11. As these show that it is the duty of a bishop to exhort and convince the gainsayer, and to stop his mouth, the question may be asked, How is this to be done? It cannot be done otherwise than to propose to the gainsayer an interview, and if he attend to it, to refute his arguments. But if he refuses to attend, the bishop has discharged his duty; for the gainsayer thereby shows that he is already convinced, and his mouth stopped, because, if he believed that he could not be refuted, he would by no means avoid the light. Again, when the gainsayer in a public debate is closely pursued by

the truth, he uses invectives instead of arguments, which is a plain indication of his mouth being stopped. A false teacher is said to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, which signifies to be under the covert of a servant of God. . . . Now, indeed, is it possible that the ministers of the North Carolina Synod represent me as the most dangerous wolf, and yet can see me come among their congregations, and gain a goodly number of their people, without even being willing to confront me in a public debate, which would be calculated to show me in mine originality. Why do they flee? Do they not feel for their flocks? To pronounce them hirelings would seem uncharitable. How could I otherwise acquit them of such a charge, unless I would suppose that they in reality do not consider me as a false teacher? Otherwise they would not flee, but stand public test. But that they have called me a false teacher is perhaps owing to the violence of the old man in them, whom they have not yet crucified through the Spirit." (44 ff.) Finally, in defending the propriety of the procedure of the Tennessee Synod, David Henkel refers to the example of Christ, who "answered the questions of the Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, and the devil. Now, as Christ debated with wicked men, yea, with the devil himself, with what face can any man say, It is wrong to dispute on doctrinal topics?" (45 f.) David Henkel concludes: "Whereas all Lutherans are pledged to their creed by a solemn vow, it must be a matter of great importance for every one to know the sentiments of the ministers under whose care he may be; for whosoever supports such as are inimical to the doctrines of the Church acts contrary to his vow. Every Lutheran ought to be certain, and able to prove by texts of Scripture, that his creed contains erroneous doctrine, before he adopts a contrary one, lest he incur the crime of perjury. The ministry of the North Carolina Synod are charged with denying the most important doctrine of the Lutheran Church, and have been requested to come to a reciprocal trial, which they have obstinately refused. Now, what is the duty of the people under their care? Ought they not to urge them to come to a reciprocal trial? How can they consider themselves safe under a ministry who are not willing to come to the light!" (47.)

**DOCTRINAL BASIS.**

**105. Attitude toward the Scriptures.** — Regarding the constitution of the Tennessee Synod we read in the Report of 1827: "Whereas the constitution [of 1820] of this Synod is blended with the transactions of the session at which it was formed, and as the unalterable articles are not distinguished from those that are local and of a temporary nature, and as the language is not sufficiently explicit, it was deemed necessary, in order to supply those defects, to supply another. Consequently a committee was appointed to draw up one for examination." The committee complied with the order, drew up a constitution, and laid it before the body. Every one of its articles having been critically examined, Synod resolved: "1. That this constitution shall be annexed to this journal [Report]; but it shall not now be adopted nor ratified, so that the absent ministers, as well as the congregations may have the opportunity of alleging their probable objections, or of proposing necessary amendments. This also affords an opportunity for the members of the present session to re-examine it. 2. But that, if no objection of importance shall be alleged, or necessary amendments proposed by any member of this body, or by any congregation, and be laid before the next session, it shall then be considered as the adopted and ratified constitution of this Synod." (9.) In the following year the new constitution was adopted and ratified in a somewhat revised form, and appended to the minutes of the same year. The English version is found also in the Report of 1853. The First Article of this constitution reads as follows: "The Holy Scriptures, or the inspired writings of the Old and New Testaments, shall be the only rule of doctrine and church-discipline. The correctness or incorrectness of any translations is to be judged according to the original tongues, in which the Scriptures were first written." (B. 1828, 13; R. 1853, 20.) The Introduction declared: "Nothing relative to doctrines and church-discipline ought to be transacted according to the mere will of the majority or minority, but in strict conformity with Holy Writ." (B. 1828, 12; R. 1853, 19.) According to the constitution of 1828, therefore, Tennessee recognized the Holy Scriptures as the only norm and rule of doctrine and life. This

had been the position of the Tennessee Synod from the very beginning. As early as 1822 they declared: "Forasmuch as the Holy Bible is the only rule of matters respecting faith and church-discipline, and because the Augsburg Confession of Faith is a pure emanation from the Bible, and comprises the most important doctrines of faith and discipline, hence it must always remain valid. Therefore our Synod can neither be governed by a majority nor a minority, now nor ever hereafter, with respect to doctrine and discipline. This is the reason why nothing can be introduced among us, now nor at any time hereafter, which may be repugnant to the Bible and the Augsburg Confession of Faith. Neither the majority nor the minority shall determine what our doctrine and discipline are, because they are already determined in the above-named rule. But that we assemble from time to time is neither to form new rules, doctrines, nor traditions, but as united instruments in the hand of God we wish to promulgate the doctrine of the Bible, and to execute the rules already laid down in the Holy Scriptures. But with respect to local and temporary regulations, such as the place and time of meeting, and such like things, which do not interfere with matters of faith and discipline, the Synod suit themselves to the conveniences of the most of their members. We refer the reader to the Seventh, Fifteenth, and Twenty-eighth Articles of the Augsburg Confession of Faith, where he may find more satisfactory instructions with respect to these things." (R. 1822, 9 f.)

**106. Augsburg Confession Adopted with a "Quia."**— From the very beginning the Tennessee Synod regarded the Book of Concord as a correct exhibition of the teachings of Holy Writ, although at first only the Augsburg Confession was officially received into the constitution. At its organization in 1820 Synod declared: "All doctrines of faith and the doctrine of the Christian Life, as well as all books which are used for public worship in the Church, shall, as far as possible, be arranged and observed according to the Holy Scriptures and the Augsburg Confession. Especially shall the youth and others who have need thereof in our Church be instructed according to the Small Catechism of Dr. Luther, as has been the custom hitherto. Said Catechism shall always be the chief catechism

of our Church." (4.) "Whoever will be a teacher shall solemnly promise that he will teach according to the Word of God, and the Augsburg Confession, and the doctrine of our Church." (5.) The minutes of 1821 record: "On motion made by Mr. Peter Boger, it was resolved that a copy of the Augsburg Confession of Faith, likewise a copy of the minutes of the Synod, shall be deposited in every church." (8.) The Second Article of the new constitution, adopted 1828, reads as follows: "The Augustan Confession of Faith, comprised in twenty-eight articles, as it is extant in the book entitled 'The Christian Concordia,' is acknowledged and received by this body, *because* it is a true declaration of the principal doctrines of faith and of church-discipline. Neither does it contain anything contrary to the Scriptures. No minister shall therefore be allowed to teach anything, nor shall this body transact anything that may be repugnant to any article of this Confession. Luther's Smaller Catechism is also acknowledged and received, because it contains a compendium of Scriptural doctrines, and is of great utility in the catechising of youth." (R. 1853, 21.) The "Remarks" appended to this article explain: "Creeds fraught with human tradition and opinions are rejected by this body. Neither is the authority of a general council considered as valid, or sufficient to establish any point of doctrine. . . . Now there is a considerable difference when a body of Christians receive a human composition [symbol] as an unerring guide in addition to the Scriptures, or when they receive it to show their views as respecting points of doctrine. Lutherans acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of doctrine and discipline; nevertheless they receive the Augustan Confession *because* it exhibits the same views they have on the Scriptures, and is a formal declaration of what they believe. But if it were possible to prove that the views on the points of doctrine contained in the Augustan Confession were erroneous, it would be the duty of this body to renounce it; nevertheless, in that case they could by no means be Lutherans, as they would have rejected the views of Lutherans. As there have been various editions of the Augustan Confession, this body have chosen the one which is extant in the book entitled 'The Christian Concordia,' because they are well assured that that is genuine." (22.) The revised con-

stitution of 1866 recognized the entire Book of Concord as being the doctrinal basis of the Tennessee Synod, thereby merely giving expression to the position which the Tennessee Synod had actually occupied from the very beginning. In their letter of December 10, 1826, addressed to the pastors of the North Carolina Synod, Daniel Moser and David Henkel declared: "We also wish to appeal to the book called 'Concordia,' as it is one of the principal symbolical books of the Lutheran Church." (R. 1827, 28.) The sixth of the "Alterable Articles" of the proposed constitution submitted to synod in 1827 reads: "The book entitled 'Concordia,' which contains the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church, shall be viewed as a directory in Theology." (24.) After visiting the Tennessee Synod in 1855, Brohm wrote: "Creditable witnesses have given me the assurance that, as far as their persons are concerned, all the pastors of the Synod adhere to the entire Concordia." (*Lutheraner* 11, 78.) When the Tennessee Synod was organized, it was the only American Lutheran synod which was pledged to the Lutheran Confession, not merely with a *quatenus*, *i. e.*, as far as it agrees with the Bible, but with an honest *quia*, *i. e.*, because it agrees with the Bible.

### CONFESsION ENFORCED.

**107. Confession No Mere Dead Letter.** — That Tennessee did not regard the Lutheran Confession as a mere dead document appears from her attitude toward the Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and other unfaithful Lutheran synods, as delineated above. The treatise appended to the Report of 1827 declared: It is necessary to correct the wrong opinion that Lutheran ministers are at liberty to deviate from the Augustan Confession wherinsoever they conceive it as erroneous. As long as a minister pretends to be a Lutheran minister, he has no right to deviate from any article of this Confession. Let him remember his vows! If any one should discover that the Augsburg Confession is unscriptural, he is justified and bound to renounce it. But if he continues to preach under its cover, he is guilty of a twofold fraud. He deceives the Church by causing Lutherans to believe that he agrees with them. And he deceives the Christians by failing to warn them against

what he regards erroneous teaching. If Luther and the Lutheran Confessions erred, "why do such as believe this call themselves Lutherans? Such practise a fraud by being called Lutherans, when they affirm that Luther taught erroneous doctrines; or else must own that, by being called after him, they sanction such errors." (38.) Tennessee was not satisfied with being *called* Lutheran. They were seriously determined to *be* Lutherans. The Lutheran Confessions were the living norm of both their preaching and their practise. In publishing books, receiving pastors and teachers, examining candidates, in negotiating with other synods, Tennessee was scrupulously guided and governed by the Lutheran Symbols. In 1821 they resolved on a Liturgy to be prepared by Paul Henkel "according to the Augsburg Confession of Faith and the Bible." (7.) In 1826 it was resolved that Luther's Smaller Catechism should be translated into the English language, and that Ambrose Henkel was to provide both for an *accurate translation* and for the publication of the Catechism. (7.) Numerous instances where pastors were carefully examined with respect to doctrine before they were admitted to membership are recorded in the synodical minutes. In the Report of 1831, *e. g.*, we read: "Mr. Rankin [who previously had been a member of the Presbyterian Church] presented himself to the committee. He was first made a full member of the Lutheran Church by confirmation. Then, having taken the most solemn pledge, he was ordained a pastor of the same Church with prayer and laying on of hands." (8.) The Report of 1832 records: "Whereas Mr. Rankin, as appears from a letter of Mr. Bonham, addressed to Synod, and from other trustworthy sources from Green County, Tenn., *has departed from the Augsburg Confession*, both as to doctrine and discipline, it was resolved that Mr. Rankin be requested to attend the next session of our Synod, and there defend himself against the above-mentioned charges, otherwise we can regard him as member of this Synod no longer." (9. 16.) In the Report of 1827 we find the following entry: "It was considered necessary that one of the pastors should visit all the other pastors, and their congregations, and examine whether there be any who deviate from the doctrines and rules of our Church. But as none of the pastors who were present could undertake this visit, it was resolved that any of the absent

ministers who may volunteer his services shall hereby be authorized to make this visit, and to reprove all errors that may come within his knowledge. Whatever pastor may undertake this visit is requested to inform the secretary of his intention, and to hand in a report of his journey at the next session." (12.)

**108. Symbols Regarded as Necessary.** — In the "Remarks," appended to the Second Article of the constitution, adopted 1828, the necessity of symbols is explained as follows: "Now the question may be put, Is not the Augustan Confession a human composition? Why is it adopted by this body? Answer: The Apostle Peter exhorts Christians to 'be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them,' etc. 1 Pet. 3, 15. 16. From the history of the Reformation it is evident that the Protestants were called upon to deliver their confession of faith before the diet assembled at Augsburg. Every Christian is not only privileged, but also commanded to confess what he believes. Although the Scriptures be a sufficient guide without any other, and though there be but one explanation of them which can be correct, yet not all who profess Christianity explain them alike, for their views are widely different. Hence, as all do not explain the Scriptures alike, it could not be known what each body of Christians believed; consequently others could not know whether they should fellowship them, provided they had not a formal declaration of their views on the points of doctrine contained in the Scriptures. But when a body of Christians make a formal declaration of their views on the Holy Scriptures, others are enabled to judge whether they be correct, and thus may know with whom to hold Christian fellowship. . . . Lutherans acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of doctrine and discipline; nevertheless they receive the Augustan Confession because it exhibits the same views they have on the Scriptures, and is a formal declaration of what they believe." (22.) According to his own report of a conversation with a pastor of the General Synod, dated December 2, 1824, Andrew Henkel answered as follows the objection that the Scriptures are sufficient, and that for that reason symbols are superfluous: "I told him then that

he had departed from the Augsburg Confession, and, of course, from the Lutheran Church. He then told me that the Bible was his creed, and not the Augsburg Confession, and that the said Confession contained things which were not in the Scriptures. I then replied and said that every fanatic and sectarian said so, and that Lutherans as much considered the Scriptures to be the only guide in doctrines as he or any other person did, but that it was necessary to have some standard by which men could know how the Scriptures were understood by this or the other denominations, as men varied materially in their explanations of the Scriptures. I then demanded of him to show wherein the Confession did not correspond with the Scriptures. He referred me to the word 'real' in the article of the Lord's Supper, and added that that word was inserted by the hot-headed Luther."

#### ANTI-ROMANISTIC ATTITUDE.

**109. Church Governed by Word of God Alone.** — The Tennessee Synod did not only realize the importance of the Symbols for the Lutheran Church, but had correctly apprehended also their spirit and doctrinal content. This appears from her uncompromising attitude toward the Romanistic, Reformed, Methodistic, and unionistic tendencies prevailing in the Lutheran synods and congregations at the time of her organization. As to polity, the cast of the first American Lutheran synods and congregations was of the hierarchical type. The congregations were subordinate to their pastors, the pastors and congregations to their respective synods, as a rule called ministeriums, because, essentially, they were bodies composed of ministers. David Henkel had experienced the tyranny to which such an order would naturally lead and lend itself. The Tennessee Synod must be credited with being the first, in a large measure, to recognize, confess, and defend the inalienable rights of all Christians and Christian congregations. The Henkels must be regarded as champions also of the basic truth of all normal church-government, *viz.*, that no one is to govern the Christian Church, save Christ and His Word alone, not the pastor, nor the ministerium, nor the synod, nor any sort of majority. (1820, 23; 1828, 12.) In 1820, when the leaders of the North Carolina Synod, in matters of right and

wrong, demanded subjection to the majority of votes, the Henkels maintained: "We thought the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, of which we were assured that it can be proved by the doctrine of the Bible, ought to be of greater authority to us than the voice of a majority of men who are opposed to the doctrine and order of our Church." (1820, 23.) Nothing short of clear proof and conviction from the Word of God and the Augsburg Confession would satisfy the Henkels. In 1822 Tennessee declared: "Our Synod can neither be governed by a majority nor a minority, now nor ever hereafter, with respect to doctrine and discipline. . . . Neither the majority nor the minority shall determine what our doctrine and discipline are to be, because they are already determined in the above-named rule. . . . But with respect to local and temporary regulations, such as the place and time of meeting, and such like things, which do not interfere with matters of faith and discipline, the Synod suit themselves to the conveniences of the most of their members." (R. 1822, 9.) In a "Note" appended to the above declaration, David Henkel defines the position of Tennessee as follows: "Herein is the difference between the government of the pure Evangelical Lutheran Church and the government of the General Synod. The established rule of the pure Christian Church is the Holy Scriptures and her supreme Head, Jesus Christ. Christ, by His Word, governs the Church in the doctrines of faith and discipline; there needeth no majority of votes to determine. In such matters as do not immediately interfere with the doctrines of faith and government of the Church, as, for instance, to appoint the time and place for the meeting of a synod, or the erection of a synod, and such like things, herein our Church doth not seek to exercise any authority, but granteth liberty to each congregation and to each of her ministers to act and do as they judge it most convenient for themselves. No one is despised for not joining with us in our Synod; no one is oppressed who is not in conformity with us in matters which are not essential to the doctrine of faith. Nothing can separate our union or break our peace with any, only when they deviate from the pure doctrine of the Gospel, and when they compose traditions of their own and impose them on others. A majority is not to have authority over any one, because they

have no power to impose traditions of men on others with regard to religion. The government of the General Synod is altogether otherwise. . . . It is plainly to be seen in her constitution that her aim is to impose a number of human traditions on the Church, as, for instance, that no synod shall be erected in any State, unless there are six ordained ministers living therein, and not even then unless they are authorized by the General Synod. The General Synod is to be governed by a majority; if it were not so, she would admit that every congregation and every minister should act agreeably to their own advantage in matters not interfering with the doctrines of faith, and not seek such universal power, by which they may compel men to act according to the will of a majority. The Church of God on earth was never constantly governed right by a majority. In the times of the prophets the Church was oppressed by a majority. . . . How was it in the time of Christ? How did the majority act against the Savior? Who was right? The great council of Jerusalem and thousands of their adherents, or Jesus of Nazareth, and the few of His disciples who were despised by the world? How was it in the days of Luther? What was he against millions of the Papist Church? And yet every Protestant will confess that Luther's cause was just, and is thankful to God that the light of the Gospel was set up by Luther. But supposing that Luther had yielded to be governed by a majority as the advocates for a General Synod insist, or wish that the Church should be governed by a majority, might we not have remained in the ignorance of blind popery to the present day? The government of the world is supported by a majority, and thus, many imagine to themselves, it ought so to be in the Church; but they are greatly mistaken! Jesus saith, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' and consequently not His manner of government. . . . Jesus Himself hath already prescribed all things respecting the doctrine and discipline of His Church, therefore we need no General Synod to give us prescriptions! As touching matters not essential, as appointing the time and place of a convention or the like, whereof no prescription is given, no one is justifiable to give any prescription or direction, much less to compel any one thereto, whereas all are to enjoy Christian liberty. See Rom. 14; Col. 2. But those of the Gen-

eral Synod undertake to erect universal directions in these matters, or else they would not name their Synod Universal. Whosoever submits himself to be governed by a majority must be such as trust to a majority. The Scripture saith: 'Cursed is the man who putteth his trust in man.' Jer. 17." (R. 1822, 11 f.) These views were embodied also in the constitution of 1828. In the explanatory "Remarks" to the Fourth Article we read: "As the aforesaid duties [to supply laborers, detect false teachers, examine and ordain ministerial candidates, etc.] devolve on all churches and ministers, they undoubtedly have the privilege to perform them jointly, *i. e.*, they may constitute a synod. But no Christian synod can have legislative powers, consequently have no right to make rules for churches. All necessary and salutary rules pertaining to the government of the Church are prescribed in the Scriptures; therefore every body of men who make rules for the Church are in opposition to Christ. To make rules for the Church is one thing, but to execute these rules already made, and to employ the proper means for the promulgation of the Gospel, is another. The latter, but by no means the former, is the business of this body. That there ought to be no appeals from the decisions of congregations is evident from Matt. 18, 15—20." (B. 1828, 20; R. 1853, 25.) Of course, appeals from the congregation to the synod as a higher authority, to which the congregation is subordinated, were meant. The Introduction to the constitution says: "The rules and principles of church-government are contained in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore no body of Christians have authority to dispense with, or alter or transact, anything contrary to them. Human traditions or rules impressed upon the Church as necessary for Christian fellowship, which have no foundation in the Scriptures, are rejected by our Savior. Matt. 15, 9. 13. 14." Although, in executing the rules of the Church, different times, persons, and local circumstances intervene, as, for instance, in one age and country one language is prevalent, but not in another age, and perhaps not in the same country . . . , nevertheless, Christ being omniscient, and His all-wise Spirit having inspired His apostles, they have provided the Church with salutary rules, which are applicable to all persons in all places, times, and circumstances. Nothing relative to doc-

trines and church-discipline ought to be transacted according to mere will of the majority or minority, but in strict conformity to the Scriptures. Local and temporary regulations, such as the time and place of the meeting of the synod, the ratio of representatives from congregations, etc., may be varied for the sake of convenience, hence are subject to be altered, amended, or abolished by the majority; yet they ought not to attempt to make their decisions in such cases absolutely obligatory upon the whole community, because such regulations are only subservient to the execution of the rules which are founded upon the Scriptures." (19.)

**110. Antihierarchical Principles Practised.** — The organization of, and connection with, a synod was regarded by Tennessee as a matter not of divine obligation, but of Christian wisdom and liberty. No congregation was condemned or refused fellowship merely because it refused to unite organically with their synod. In the "Remarks" to the Fourth Article of her constitution Tennessee explains: "When ministers and lay-delegates are assembled, they may have a more accurate knowledge of the exigencies of the whole connection they represent, hence are the better enabled to impart their counsel. By their simultaneous efforts, vacant churches may be supplied with ministerial labors, and others formed and organized. Indeed, the same end may also be obtained by individual ministers and churches; nevertheless, as it frequently becomes necessary for such to receive cooperation from their brethren, this end may be obtained with more facility by the meeting of a Synod." (1853, 25.) According to Tennessee, then, the organization of, and connection with, a synod is a matter of Christian liberty, wisdom, and expediency. But, while not opposed to synods as such, Tennessee most strenuously objected to any kind of human autocracy within the synods and congregations. When, in a letter, several members of the North Carolina Synod designated Paul Henkel as "the head" of the Tennessee Synod, the latter declared, and could do so truthfully, that their Synod "confesses no man as its head save the one and only God-man, Jesus Christ." (B. 1824, 10.) The fact is that, in the beginning, Tennessee was even without standing officers. The chairmen were elected

and changed at pleasure even during the sessions of the same convention. (B. 1820, 7.) Largely, her opposition to the General Synod also was rooted in her determined hostility to every form of Romanism. (R. 1820, 55; 1821, 17.) "If you will consider," they said to the North Carolina Synod, which had joined the General Synod, "what pertains to true Christianity, you certainly cannot reasonably desire that a government shall be forced upon the Church, of which no trace can be found in the Bible." (B. 1824, Anhang 2.) Indeed, in their aversion to any and every form of synodical dominion over the congregations Tennessee frequently went so far as to create the impression that they viewed with suspicion and as questionable, if indeed not as directly objectionable and sinful, every form of organization of synods into a *general* body. On this point, also in her criticism of the General Synod, Tennessee frequently ran riot. But, though occasionally losing her balance and making a wrong application of her antihierarchical doctrine, the principle as such was sound to the core and truly Lutheran. When the North Carolina Synod, without further investigation, annulled a ban of excommunication which David Henkel's congregation had imposed, Tennessee repudiated the action as an infringement on the rights of the congregation. "For," said they, "it cannot be proven anywhere that a synod has authority to break the decision made by the church council and the congregation. In such matters a congregation has greater power than any synod." (B. 1820, 20.) In agreement herewith the Fourth Article of the constitution submitted in 1827 provided: "But this Synod shall have no power to receive appeals from the decision of congregations, with respect to the excommunication or receiving of members. For every congregation in this respect is independent of the Synod." The German version adds: "Hence Synod cannot change or annul a decision of any congregation pertaining to the exclusion or the acceptance of a member." (R. 1827, 22; B., 21.) The form in which this article was finally adopted (1828) reads: "But this Synod shall have no power to receive appeals from the decisions of, nor to make rules nor regulations for, congregations." (B. 1828, 19; R. 1853, 25.) Neither did the Tennessee Synod arrogate to itself the right to appoint pastors to the congregations or to remove them. The Report of 1824 records con-

cerning Adam Miller: "This young man displays strong inclination for preaching; but since he has produced *no regular call from a congregation*, he could not be ordained." (14.) The Tennessee Synod claimed no power whatever over the individual congregations. The minutes of 1825 record: "It is reported that this Synod, in 1821, ordered all the congregations not to suffer any minister who is connected with the General Synod to preach in their meeting-houses. Be it therefore known to all whom it may concern that there was no such a resolution adopted; although, there was a petition handed in, subscribed by three congregations in Tennessee, in which they stated that they had adopted a resolution among themselves not to suffer a minister belonging to the General Synod to preach in their meeting-houses, and also petitioned the Synod to admonish all the congregations to concur with their resolution. But the Synod sanctioned their resolution only in part, in so far as not to be connected with the General Synod; yet the Synod do not arrogate to themselves any authority to prescribe to any congregation, whom they shall suffer to preach in their meeting-houses. All congregations in this respect are independent of the Synod." (R. 1825, 11; 1821, 7.) The Report of 1832 declared: "This body arrogates to itself no power to make laws and rules for the congregations, because it is against their rights and liberties, as well as also against the Fourth Article of our constitution." Indeed, such was their care not to exceed their authority that, *e.g.*, Synod, super-scrupulously, refrained even from making a declaration how to further the instruction of the young, but contented itself with merely advising "the diverse church councils and congregations to make such rules and arrangements how they might most fittingly and conveniently (wie es fuer sie am schicklichsten und bequemsten sei) instruct their young." (B. 1832, 9.) According to the Fourth Article of the constitution it was the business of Synod "to detect and expose false doctrines and false teachers." But the "Remarks" appended to this article are careful to explain: "That it shall be the duty of this body to detect erroneous doctrines and false teachers does by no means suppose that the same does not also devolve upon individual churches and ministers, for this body does not claim it as their prerogative. But it is believed that this duty may

be performed more advantageously by a synod." (R. 1853, 25; B. 1828, 19.) Even the right of examining and ordaining ministers was not denied to the congregation. The draft of the constitution published 1827 declared: "The business of this body shall be . . . to examine (*if requested*) candidates for the ministry who may be called by congregations, and, if they be found qualified, to consecrate them with the imposition of hands and prayer." (R. 1827, 22.) The reading adopted in 1828 ran thus: "The business of this body shall be to impart their useful advice . . . and, *upon application*, to examine candidates for the ministry." (1853, 24.) The "Remarks" appended offer this explanation: "Neither does this body claim the exclusive right of examining and ordaining candidates for the ministry. For every congregation has the privilege of choosing fit persons for their ministers, and individual pastors have the authority to perform their ordination. This is evident from the practise of the primitive Christians, as well as from the Scriptures. But when any congregation shall *request* this body to examine and ordain the person of their choice, it then devolves on this body to perform this duty. As the aforesigned duties devolve on all churches and ministers, they undoubtedly have the privilege to perform them jointly, *i. e.*, they may constitute a synod. But no Christian synod can have legislative powers, consequently have no right to make rules for churches." (1853, 25.)

**111. Rights of Laymen Recognized.** — From the very beginning the Tennessee Synod vindicated to the deputies of the congregations the right not merely to listen, to witness, and to testify, when called upon to do so by the ministers, as had been the custom in the Pennsylvania Synod, but also, on equal terms with the pastors, to deliberate, decide, and vote on all matters submitted to Synod. (*Lutheraner* 11, 166.) Article Three of the Constitution declared: "It shall not be allowed either for the ministers to transact any business exclusively of the lay delegates, or for the lay delegates exclusively of the ministers; provided there shall be both ministers and lay delegates present." (B. 1828, 16; R. 1853, 23.) The "Remarks" appended, add the following: "It is not the privilege and duty of the clergy alone to impart their counsel in ecclesiastical matters, and to employ means for the promulgation of the

Gospel, but also of other Christians. The first Christian council was convened in Jerusalem, and consisted of the apostles, the elders, and the other brethren. They decided the question whether it was necessary to be circumcised. See Acts 15, 1—31. The apostles were inspired, hence could have made the decision, without the assistance of the lay brethren; but it appears they desired no such prerogative. This precedent justifies the laity in being in council with the clergy for the purpose of deliberating on the most important ecclesiastical matters. Christians, in common, are called 'a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people,' and they are 'to show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvelous light.' 1 Pet. 2, 9. Now, since Christians in common have such honorable titles, sustain such a high dignity, and are to manifest the praises of God, it may be concluded that they have the same rights in church-government as the clergy. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, said: 'Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that ye shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?' 1 Cor. 6, 2. 3. Not only the believing ministers, but also the laity are saints. . . . Now, if saints shall judge the world, even the angels, why should they not also be capable and privileged to transact the most important matters pertaining to the Church? That laymen should exercise equal rights with clergymen in church-government, is not only Scriptural, but also conducive to the preservation both of civil and ecclesiastical liberty. . . . From the history of the Church it appears that whenever the clergy governed without the laity, they enslaved the people, grasped civil authority, and persecuted those who detected or opposed their aspiring views. This not only has been the case under the reign of Popery, but also some of the clergymen who called themselves Protestants have been the most bloody persecutors." (B. 1828, 17; R. 1853, 23.) In accordance with these principles, laymen in the Tennessee Synod were also represented on, or even exclusively composed, most important committees. Thus, in 1824, three laymen were elected members of the committee which was to confer with the North Carolina Synod in an effort to remove the doctrinal

differences separating them. "They appointed farmers," Jacob Sherer of the North Carolina Synod, in a letter, remarked contemptuously, "to instruct us, who in public print have slandered us, and treated us scornfully when it is known to them that the priests' lips are to preserve the doctrine." David Henkel, then secretary of the Tennessee Synod, however, in a "Note," recorded in the Report of 1825, justified the action of Tennessee. Here he wrote: "I conceive it to be my duty to observe that it is truly astonishing that farmers should not also, as well as ministers, be capable of judging the Christian doctrine. Whenever it shall be proved that farmers are not to read the Holy Scriptures, then only ought they to be excluded from this important business. It is well known that in the dark ages of Popery the layman was not permitted to judge in religious controversies, and it seems very alarming that Mr. Sherer has expressed a similar sentiment, inasmuch as he considers himself much offended because the Synod appointed laymen or, as he says, farmers to constitute the committee. That the priests' lips are to preserve the doctrine does not prove that it is inexpedient or wrong to appoint laymen to assist on deciding a dispute. It was believed laymen would act more impartially, since the ministers are more immediately concerned in this controversy. Neither can I discover that all farmers are so contemptible a class of people (so niedertrechtinge Leute) that Mr. Sherer could possibly be offended at the appointment! If in case the committee have published anything, which is contrary to truth, Mr. Sherer is at liberty to make it appear." (R. 1825, 6.)

#### ANTI-METHODISTIC ATTITUDE.

**112. Fanatics Described.** — At the time of the organization of the Tennessee Synod the Lutheran Church of America generally was suffering with a threefold malady: Unionism, Reformedism, and Methodism. Methodism may be defined as a diseased condition of Christianity, causing Christians to base their assurance of salvation not on the gracious promises of God in the objective means of grace, the Word and Sacraments, but on feelings and experiences produced by their own efforts and according to their own methods. As the years rolled on,

the early Lutheran Church in America became increasingly infected with this poison of subjectivism and enthusiasm, especially its English portions. Rev. Larros of Eaton, O., said in a letter to Paul Henkel, dated August 2, 1821: "I remember when eighteen or twenty years ago many among the Germans in North Carolina were awakened as to their salvation, and we, in joyful hope, spared no trouble teaching and instructing, in order to make of them men for the kingdom of Jesus, preserving the Bible-religion, that even then one could notice how some were flushed and puffed up with pride. This was evident especially at the time of the great revival of the English Church, when, at the large meetings, their novices [“Neulinge,” young English preachers] admonished the people, and, to the detriment of the Church and the depreciation of the older ministers, by their bold and arrogant actions indicated, that they understood the business of converting the people better than the old preachers, and this without being called to order by their superiors. Since that time impudence and lust of ruling have greatly increased, so that the fruit of it appears at public synods." (B. 1821, 35.) The Methodistic doctrine of conversion, as related above, was a point of dispute also between the North Carolina and Tennessee Synods. The Tennessee Report of 1820 states this difference as follows: "Since our opponents [of the North Carolina Synod] refuse to admit that regeneration is wrought in the manner taught by our Church, we infer that they believe it must be effected in an altogether different way. For almost all religionists of this time teach most frequently and diligently and urge most earnestly that one must *experience* regeneration, or be eternally lost. We are also accused by many that we deny the doctrine of regeneration. Our answer is: We do not deny the doctrine of regeneration at all; moreover, we teach it as well as our opponents. But that regeneration is effected in the manner and by the means such as they teach and pretend, this we cannot believe, nor do we admit that it is possible in this way. Some of them teach and maintain that regeneration cannot be wrought in any other way than by fear and terror, when one, experiencing true contrition and sorrow of sin, is moved to pray and cry anxiously, beseeching the Holy Ghost to perform in him the work of regeneration. They hold that the Holy

Ghost can operate this in such only as are previously brought into this state of fear and terror. As a natural birth cannot be effected without pain, in like manner, they argue, no one could be born anew without previously, through anguish and fear, having experienced pains of the soul, more or less. Such teachers, however, fail to observe that by this example they contradict themselves. For in a natural birth, as everybody knows, only the mother has pain, not the child, while according to their doctrine the child ought to have the pain. Who, therefore, does not see that their teaching is most absurd and questionable? Now, in order to bring about regeneration in the manner they teach, it is the rule to preach the Law and its curse. To produce the required pangs of the soul, the poor people are threatened with the devil, eternal death, and hell. The intention is to cause a sinner to pray earnestly in order, by such prayer, to receive the Holy Spirit. To produce this result, joint prayers are said to contribute the most, *viz.*, when a number of people gather and strain every power of body and soul in crying and screaming to move the Holy Spirit, or even to force Him, to finish the work of regeneration. They imagine that, by their own exercises in prayer, and especially by their joint prayers, they have advanced the matter and earned and obtained the Holy Ghost, and that, He [the Holy Ghost] having united with their exercises and labor, the work of regeneration was finished through the combined operation of their prayers and the gifts of the Holy Spirit acquired by them. They mistake imaginations for divine revelations. And the sensations rising from such imaginations they regard as effects of the Holy Spirit. They apply to themselves what the Apostle Paul writes Rom. 8, 16: 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.' They declare: We are born anew, and we know indeed that it is so, for the Spirit of God has given testimony to our spirit. But if one desires to learn how He had given this testimony, whether they had seen Him or heard Him, or in what manner or whereby He had given such assurance, they appeal to their imaginations and sensations, from which also something peculiar, like an apparition, may come to them; but whatever this is we do not know. One can be absolutely sure, however, that it is

not the Holy Spirit. For as soon as you let them understand that you believe that they have been deceived and you endeavor to lead their attention to the testimonies of Holy Scripture in order to obtain from it reliable testimonies, immediately their anger begins to rise, their countenance becomes disfigured, and, alas, with some already a fist is clenching with which they strike the table or their knees and declare defiantly: 'I don't care anything for what you say; it is none of your business; I know that I am born of God, and will suffer it to be taken away from me by nobody, by no learned man, nor by any devil; what I know I do know.' There is a reason, why such a person will not suffer his opinion to be taken from him by anybody, and he need not fear that any devil will rob him of it, especially when he is ready to use his fist in defense of his opinion." (B. 1820, 32 ff.)

**113. Sober Attitude of Tennessee Synod.** — In opposition to the subjectivism of the Methodistic enthusiasts within the Lutheran synods, Tennessee based the certainty of salvation on the objective means of grace, placing especial emphasis on the well-known comforting passages of Holy Writ concerning Baptism, such as John 3, 5; Eph. 5, 23. 25. 26; Titus 3, 5; 1 Pet. 3, 20. 21; Rom. 6, 3—5; Acts 2, 38; 22, 16; Gal. 3, 26. 27; Mark 16, 16. "These passages of the Bible," they said, "show us that we are not to seek salvation in any work which we ourselves can create or perform, no matter whatever its nature may be, but only through faith on the Lord and Savior Christ, who alone has done everything for us, and through the grace which He bestows and confers on us in Holy Baptism, whereby we are regenerated." (B. 1820, 34.) Again: "From the passages here quoted the attentive reader is able to see and comprehend that regeneration is not effected in the manner as some teach." It was evident from the Scriptures, they maintained, that Christ referred to Baptism when He declared that no one can enter the kingdom of God unless he was born again of the water and the Spirit. They explained: Self-evidently it is not a natural power or effect of the water to wash away sin. "Yet we see that the washing and cleansing from sin is effected alone [?] through Baptism, and that by faith alone such grace is appropriated. Accordingly, whoever

believes and is baptized shall be saved. Mark 16, 16." (38.) In this passage, Mark 16, 16, Tennessee declared, "Christ in a few and clear words indicates the whole condition under which a man can be saved. It consists in this, that he believes that, for the sake of Christ and what He has done and suffered for us, God will forgive all our sins, and that by faith, in Baptism, he appropriates such promises of all the gifts of salvation which God imparts to man for Jesus' sake. This also shows us that man cannot be saved by his own work or merit, but alone by what God presents and imparts to him. He obtains faith through preaching, which is by the Word of God, as Paul writes, Rom. 10, 17. Baptism is administered by the command of Jesus Christ, Matt. 28, 19, through the service of the minister of the Church. In this way God, through means, seeks man before man seeks Him. Accordingly, for having been translated into the state of salvation, man is to thank God and His ordinances alone, not himself, his merit, his own works, or his experiences." "Because we understand and teach this matter in the manner indicated, we are said to despise prayer, declare it unnecessary, and teach men that it is sufficient for salvation if they are baptized and attend the Lord's Supper, and that nothing else is needed. To this we answer: Whoever is baptized and has *true faith* in Christ, is in need of nothing else in order to die a blessed death; if he should die thus, he would be saved, for whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved. And Paul writes to the Galatians: 'Ye are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' However, if they are possessed of the true faith, they will also acknowledge the grace of God, for which they thank Him heartily. Whoever truly believes, loves his neighbor; indeed, he loves all men, he prays for all, being moved to do so by love and compassion toward all. Such a one will also experience many temptations and tribulations by the devil, the world, and his own flesh against which he will have to fight and strive daily. This will cause him trouble and teach him to pray of his own accord. Such people we advise to pray heartily, and give them instruction therein. And this we do for the reason that God in His Word promises to hear them, and that they may be strengthened in faith, to continue faithfully to the end,

but not in order that thereby they may be born anew." (36 f.) The question, "How does the Spirit give testimony?" was answered by David Henkel as follows: "When an evil-doer condemned to death receives a document with the name and seal of the Governor affixed, that his crime is pardoned, and that he shall be set free, then he is in possession of something upon which he may firmly rely. By it he cannot be deceived, as would be the case when such a thing merely appeared to him in his thoughts, or he had dreamt that he was set free. In like manner he cannot be deceived who firmly believes the assurances given him in the Word of God that God, for the sake of Christ, has forgiven all his sins. The Spirit is then giving him, through the Word, firm assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. And if he remains in faith, he always has this firm assurance in the Gospel which proclaims the forgiveness of sins. All men could have such an assurance if by faith they were obedient to the Gospel. The Romans had it, but only for the reason that, in accordance with the ordinance of Jesus Christ, they were baptized and believed in Him. That this text [Rom. 8, 16] does not, though always misinterpreted in this way, prove that one must have been favored with a certain heavenly vision in order to know that one's sins are forgiven, every intelligent man will see without further explanation. The Prince of Darkness always endeavors to lead men away from the ordinances and promises of God, and causes them to rely on all manner of works and merits of their own, in order, finally, to make the poor creatures believe as all Deists do, *viz.*, that Christianity is nothing but a nursery-tale. There is reason also to believe that wily Satan presents some illusion to such as, in an overwrought frame of mind, are in great expectations of seeing a vision, and that they regard it as sent from heaven, and build on it their assurance of the forgiveness of their sins." (43.) In the letter, appended to the Report of 1821, from which we quoted above, Jacob Larros says: "If I can again, after falling from baptismal grace, appropriate to myself from Holy Scripture the blessed marks of a state of grace and of regeneration, then it truly is no new grace, produced by the storming of men; but it most assuredly is the same grace promised in Baptism which has been found once more. The grace secured by storm [die ge-

stuermte Gnade] may also have its marks, drawn from the air or out of the head, not from the Bible, but from the majority of false voices." (B. 1821, 35.) Concerning the "new measures" (die "neuen Massregeln") the Report of 1841 records the following: "Now the 'new measures' were taken under advise-ment [by Synod], and after a carefully considered discussion it was unanimously Resolved, That we disapprove most strongly of the 'new measures' which have been introduced into the Lutheran Church by modern enthusiasts, because we believe that they are in conflict with the Word of God, with the doc-trine of the Augsburg Confession, with the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church, and with the usages of the Church in her best and purest era, and are calculated to arouse discord and contention between the members of the Church." (B. 1841, 10.) However, though strenuously opposed to Metho-distic enthusiasm, Tennessee, at the same time, was very con-siderate of Christians who were pietistically inclined, and care-fully avoided judging their hearts. In the Report of 1820 we read: "It is indeed true that some men of honest mind do err in this matter; they do not perceive the difference and seek in their own exercise and experience what in reality they have already received in Baptism. However, if they are but faith-ful, they will advance in holiness by the thing wherein they seek regeneration, and thus it cannot harm their salvation. The harm, however, is this, that the Prince of Darkness mis-leads many who are in such error to believe that, since they seek to be regenerated by their own works and doings, Baptism is unnecessary; and, remaining unbaptized themselves, they will not permit their children to be baptized." (43.)

#### ANTI-UNIONISTIC ATTITUDE.

**114. Refusing Fellowship to Non-Lutherans.** — The purpose of the General Synod was an external union of all bodies bearing the Lutheran name, irrespective of their dif-ferences as to doctrine and practise, and to cultivate intimate fraternal relations with other Evangelical denominations. The Tennessee Synod, on the contrary, was not only opposed to any kind of union with non-Lutheran churches, but also sought to bring about a separation of the true Lutherans from the

spurious Lutherans, and to unite the former in defense of true Lutheranism against Reformed and other corruptions then prevailing in the Lutheran synods. Unity in the spirit, unity in doctrine, unity in faith and confession, was viewed by Tennessee as the *sine qua non*, the absolutely necessary condition, of all church-fellowship, church union, and cooperation. This appears from their attitude toward the North Carolina and other synods, as described above. While Stork, Shober, and others advocated a union not only with the General Synod, but with all religious bodies in America, the Henkels and their adherents declared at the "Quarreling Synod," 1820: "The general union of the numerous religious parties, though a very desirable matter, is not to be hoped for, as we can clearly see that such a thing is impossible at this time. How should it be possible? Some teach: Christ died on the cross for all men to redeem all. Others teach: This is not true; He died only for the small number of those who, according to the holy will and the wise counsel of God, are elected from eternity and are compelled to be saved; the rest of mankind, also according to His wise counsel, God, from eternity, has ordained and elected unto damnation, and they must be lost. Again, some teach: Baptism is necessary to salvation, because Christ and His apostles teach thus. Others hold: This is not true; Baptism is a mere outward sign indicating obedience toward the command of the Lord and nothing more; Baptism is not at all necessary unto regeneration, as regeneration is wrought by the Holy Spirit without any means whatever. Some say: It is right to baptize children. Others maintain: Infant Baptism is an institution of the Pope. Others: It is of the devil. Some reject every kind of baptism. Such and similar are the people who constitute the present so-called Christendom: opinions, opposing one another, and that always will be opposed to each other! All these are supposed to be united in one church, and to become one congregation and one flock, all under the care of one shepherd. That would be like stabling together sheep, goats, lambs, cows, oxen, horses, bears, wolves, wildcats, foxes, and swine, and putting them under the care of one shepherd, saying, 'Here you have a united flock which now you may feed and pasture in peace; you have many heads under one hat, take your place among them.' That some were

much displeased by this objection to the general union is not to be wondered at, for some of that stripe were present. There were also some of almost all religious parties in attendance." (B. 1820, 26.) It is apparent from these statements that a general union of all denominations, irrespective of their doctrinal differences, was certainly not relished by Tennessee in 1820. Twenty years later Synod still occupied the same position. In 1841, after discussing an appeal which had gone out to unite all the different religious parties in one big body, Tennessee "resolved that whereas the Church of Christ is a gathering of all true believers, and is not now, nor ever has been, divided; and whereas it is impossible that all the different, contradictory teachings should agree with the Word of God; and whereas it is also impossible to bring about a Christian union of all the different denominations without the unity of opinions; and whereas the teachers do greatly differ in their views on religion and the form of church-government: a union of all the various denominations in one large body is both impossible and improper; and even if brought about, instead of furthering the kingdom of our Redeemer, it would harm the welfare thereof and jeopardize the religious liberty of our happy land." (B. 1841, 11.)

**115. Refusing Fellowship to False Lutherans.** — That the attitude of Tennessee also over against those whom they regarded as false Lutherans was of a most determined and consistent nature, and free from all unionism, has been shown above. Nor did they regard this a mere matter of policy, but of conscience. With respect to their public testimony against the errorists of the North Carolina Synod the men of Tennessee declared: "Should any one raise the accusation that it was unbecoming for us as teachers of the Gospel to publish and reveal this matter here [in the Report of 1820], to him we give the answer: The prophets in the Old Testament did also contend against every erroneous doctrine, and the Apostles Paul, Peter, and John marked all such as taught false doctrine, and warned the Christians against them. If, however, it can be proven from Holy Writ that we proclaim erroneous or false doctrine, we will suffer ourselves to be corrected. We cannot, however, for the sake of keeping the peace, let everything pass

and approve of everything they preach, for we know that it does not agree with the Holy Scriptures. It is certainly our desire to be able to live and continue to work in peace and union with all members of the entire Synod. We cannot, however, unite with them at present [because they were not agreed doctrinally]. We consider it our supreme duty and obligation to defend the doctrines of our Church against all false teachings; and though they proceed from such as call themselves Lutheran preachers, we cannot on that account spare them nor keep silence in this matter, even if we could thereby win their favor and the favor of all great men on earth." (1820, 31.) With special reference to Shober, Stork, and their compeers Tennessee declared: "Should we help them to cover such bold things as you have here read [errors concerning Baptism, Lord's Supper, etc.], because they belong to our organization and bear the name Lutheran? Can we do this with a good conscience?" (1820, 31.) True, at the "Quarreling Synod," 1820, the Henkels were charged with having served all religious parties with the Word and Sacrament. They admitted that this was true, and expressed their confidence that it had not been without blessing, at least, for some. But they added: "This, however, must also be taken into consideration, that they [the Henkels] had always taught such people what our Church teaches, and that they had never preached anything else in deference to them, or to please them. Now, if any one was agreed with our doctrine, and hence felt free to hear our doctrine and to commune with us, we could not hinder him. We do not regard the name of such people, but what they believe." (1820, 25.) However, one will admit that the practise of Tennessee at this early date does not appear to have been fully consistent. The Report of 1820, for example, records: "With the Evangelical Reformed David Henkel had no quarrel that we know of, for many of them, who are members in good standing, receive Communion from him." (18.) The following remark of the same Report uncovers a similar inconsistency: "Should any one who has been baptized according to Christ's command, and who has been confirmed in another church, desire to commune with us and to be in fellowship with our Church, it shall be permitted him, and he may be looked upon as a member of the Church without being baptized or confirmed

for the second time." (5; 1831, 8.) These shortcomings, however, do not dispute the fact that the Tennessee Synod, in a manner most energetic and persistent, endeavored to steer clear of, and opposed every kind of, unionism with the sects, as well as with unfaithful Lutherans. In 1886, however, Tennessee, untrue to its noble traditions, participated in the unionistic organization of the United Synod in the South, and in 1918 she joined the Lutheran Merger, which brought her into complete fellowship with all the unionistic synods that constituted the General Synod, opposition to which having been the primary cause of her separate organization in 1820.

### TENNESSEE AND MISSOURI.

**116. Mutual Attraction.** — The doctrinal, confessional, and practical position of the Tennessee Synod being such as described, it was but natural that, as soon as Missouri and Tennessee became acquainted with each other, both should sense their kindred spirits, and feel attracted mutually. And such was the case in spite of the fact that Tennessee at this time had practically sloughed off the German language, while Missouri was thoroughly German, and continued so for many decades. Immediately after the first contact with Tennessee, Missouri displayed a lively interest in these early protagonists of genuine confessional Lutheranism. They rejoiced in having found in the Tennessee confessors flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone. With great satisfaction they reported on the antiunionistic position which Tennessee held over against the old, apostate synods. In Loehe's *Kirchliche Mitteilungen* of 1847 we find the following: "Several Virginians came to St. Louis to the Lutheran Pastor Buenger, and asked him whether he still adhered to the old Lutheran faith, which he affirmed to their joy. Thereupon they told of Henkel. . . . They had protested against an edition of Luther's Small Catechism in which, with reference to Baptism, the words 'who believe *it*' (die *es* glauben) had been made to read 'who believe' (die *da* glauben)." (94.) The *Lutheraner* of February 22, 1848, published the Tennessee resolution, stating that they could unite with the Synod of North Carolina "only on the ground of pure and unadulterated Evangelical Luther-

anism," and added the comment: "We confess that a closer acquaintance has filled us with the best prepossessions for this Synod. As far as we can see from the Report, they are earnestly striving to preserve the treasure of pure Lutheran teaching." At the convention of the Missouri Synod at Fort Wayne, in 1849, Dr. Sihler was elected a delegate to the Tennessee Synod. He wrote to Loehe that "according to its Reports and confessions, this Synod maintains an upright churchly position." "It would be a great joy," Sihler adds, "if we could enter into definite church-fellowship with them, especially, as we, above all others, have been stigmatized as the 'exclusive Lutherans.'" (*Kirchl. Mitt.* 1849, 92.) Reviewing the Tennessee Report of 1848, Walther remarked in the *Lutheraner* of January 23, 1849: "Like its predecessor, this Report proves that this Synod belongs to the small number of those who are determined not only to be *called* Lutherans, but also to *be* and to remain Lutherans." After reporting their chief resolutions, including the one expressing their delight over the organization of the Missouri Synod, and recommending the *Lutheraner* to their German-speaking members, Walther continues as follows: "We close this extract with the sincere wish that the Lord would continue to bless this Synod, which for almost thirty years, in spite of much shame and persecution, has faithfully testified and fought against the apostasy of the so-called American Lutheran Church, especially against the General Synod, and which, as far as we know, of all the older Lutheran synods, alone has preserved in this last evil time the treasures of our Lutheran Church; and we also wish that the Lord would make this Synod a salt of the earth to stay the growing spiritual corruption in other synods." (5, 84.) At the meeting of the Tennessee Synod in 1853, a letter dated October 6, 1853, and signed by Theo. Brohm and A. Hoyer, delegates appointed by Missouri, but unable to attend personally, was read, stating, in part: "We are highly rejoiced in this vast desert and wilderness to meet a whole Lutheran synod steadfastly holding to the precious Confession of our beloved Church, and zealously engaged in divulging the unaltered doctrines and principles of the Reformation among the English portion of Lutherans, by translating the standard writings of the Fathers, at the same time firmly resisting the

allurements of those who say they are Lutherans and are not. Our Synod extends, through our instrumentality, the hand of fraternity to you, not fearing to be refused, and ardently desires, however separated from you by a different language and local interests, to cooperate with you, hand in hand, in rebuilding the walls of our dilapidated Zion. We are authorized to beseech your venerable Synod to delegate as many of your members as you may deem proper to our synodical meeting to be held next year at St. Louis, promising hereby a friendly and hospitable reception. Should your Synod next year assemble at a place more easily accessible, and more convenient to us, we, or they whom our Synod may appoint, shall not fail to attend." (1853, 18.) With special reference to a letter of Rev. A. Biewend, also a delegate appointed by the Missouri Synod, but prevented from attending, in which he expressed "the hope and desire that a more intimate acquaintance may be formed between both synods," Tennessee adopted the resolution, "That we duly appreciate the kind regard of the Missouri Synod, and that we also desire a more intimate acquaintance with them, and that we appoint Rev. J. R. Moser a delegate to the next session of that Synod." (1853, 13.) In the Tennessee minutes of 1854 we read: "The Rev. Theodore Brohm, of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, was introduced to Synod, and received as a corresponding member of this body." (5.) "During recess, Rev. Th. Brohm preached from Rev. 14, 6. 7." (11.) "The Rev. Theodore Brohm, of the Missouri Synod, being present, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted: Whereas the Rev. Theodore Brohm, of the city of New York, delegate of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, has appeared amongst us, and we are assured from personal interviews with him, as well as from other sources of information, that the Synod which he represents adhere strictly to the doctrines of the Ev. Lutheran Church, as exhibited in her confessional standards, and are zealously and actively engaged in promoting the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, be it therefore 1. Resolved, That we are highly gratified to see Brother Brohm in our midst. 2. Resolved, That we fully and cheerfully reciprocate the kind and fraternal feelings expressed and manifested towards us by the Missouri Synod. 3. Resolved, That we endeavor to cultivate

a more intimate acquaintance and a closer union with the Missouri Synod. 4. Resolved, That, for this purpose, Rev. Socrates Henkel be appointed a delegate from this body to the Eastern division of the Missouri Synod, to be holden in Baltimore; and that Rev. J. R. Moser be appointed our delegate to the Western division of said Synod, at its next session." (12; *Lutheraner* 11, 77.) Moser attended and reported to his Synod in the following year. (1856, 23.) Brohm, relating in the *Lutheraner* his visit to the Tennessee Synod, said, in part: "Let the assurance here suffice that, among the pastors in attendance, I have found a faithful adherence to our common Mother Church, and that I have not met with any essential doctrinal differences. It gave me great pleasure to observe how these men, in spite of the great dearth of English-Lutheran literature, have preserved such a living consciousness of Lutheran orthodoxy and such a firm Lutheran character." (11, 78.)

**117. Tributes from Dr. Walther.** — When, in 1852, the book, *Luther on the Sacraments*, published by the Tennessee Synod, came to Walther's attention, he wrote: "We praise God that He has caused this glorious work to succeed. The importance of the appearance of this work in this country, where the great majority of the English-speaking Lutherans have fallen into Reformed errors regarding the articles of the holy Sacraments, and are ignorant of, yea, do not even suspect, the good foundation on which the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments is built, cannot be estimated at its true value. After the Book of Concord had been presented to the English-speaking Lutherans in their own language, no better selection could have been made for them than the above-mentioned three writings [Sermon on Holy Baptism, of 1535; Letter on Anabaptism, of 1528; Confession of the Lord's Supper, of 1528] of Luther, the chosen vessel of God for the reformation of the Church. These two books, now rendered into English, are gracious visitations indeed for the English Lutheran Church of this country. May it know the time of its visitation! . . . And the right reverend Tennessee Synod, which has issued both works (the Book of Concord and Luther on the Sacraments) in the English language, as well as the dear men who,

moved by love for the truth and the Church of their fathers, have regarded neither the unspeakable labor nor the great expense connected with this undertaking — may God reward them by showering His blessings upon them in abundant measure!” (9, 115.) When the second edition of the *Book of Concord* appeared, Walther wrote: “We thank God for the unspeakable blessing which He has conferred upon the Church of our adopted fatherland [through the publication of this book], and in our hearts we bless the faithful publishers. It is surprising as well as faith-strengthening to learn that already in the first year a second edition has become necessary. May many hands reach out for it, and may a third edition soon become necessary!” (L. 11, 63.) Walther’s joy and enthusiasm over these works published by Tennessee in the English language will be understood when we remember that it was the time when the Definite Platform was preparing, and Benjamin Kurtz and others, in order to discredit the “Old Lutherans,” who still adhered to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, were boldly repeating the Heidelberg Lie (die Heidelberger Landluege), according to which Luther, shortly before his death, disavowed his doctrine regarding the Lord’s Supper. (L. 12, 31.)

### PECULIARITIES OF TENNESSEE SYNOD.

**118. Opposed to Incorporation.** — The peculiarities of the Tennessee Synod, several of which have already been alluded to, may be accounted for partly by the lack, on their part, of correct logical distinctions and clear conceptions, partly by their fear of synodical tyranny over the individual ministers and congregations. Conspicuous among these abnormalities is the rejection of civil incorporation as a reprehensible commingling of State and Church. Article 5 of the Constitution declares: “This Synod shall never be incorporated by civil government, nor have any incorporated Theological Seminary under their care.” (B. 1828, 20; 1827, 22; 1853, 26.) The “Remarks” appended explain: “This article prohibits this body ever from being incorporated by civil government. That the government of the Church ought not to be blended (ver-einbart) with the State, is a tenet of the Augustan Confession, amply supported by the Scriptures. See 28th Article. Our Lord

declared that His kingdom was not of this world. John 18, 36. That the Church ought not to be blended with the State is also according to the Constitution of the United States, whose spirit and design is to secure to every person full liberty with respect to spiritual matters. The kingdom of Christ admits of no bondage, for 'it is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' Rom. 14, 17; 'and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,' 2 Cor. 3, 17. But when the Church is identified with the State, it is also fettered by human traditions, aspiring priests obtain the power to tyrannize men's consciences. However, an ecclesiastical body may be incorporated by civil authority, and yet not be the established Church of the nation; and so far as I am acquainted with our civil constitutions there is nothing contained in them to prohibit a legislative body from incorporating any society. But when a Church is incorporated, *it approximates to a State coalition.* The Church, by an act of incorporation, if I am not greatly misinformed, would have power to enact laws and regulations binding upon all their members, and could recover by a civil suit at law any property, or its value, bequeathed to them. Thus empowered, could they not also borrow money upon the credit of their whole community for the establishment of any institution? An incorporated Church may not only preserve their funds, but they may also lend out their money on usury, and obtain a vast increase. The aspiring priests of such a body, knowing that the wealth of the Church is their interest, they invent many schemes to enlarge the so-called treasury of God, lest it should ever get exhausted. They fetter the conscience of some persons, by telling them that they ought to promote the cause of God, by casting their donations into the sacred treasury, so that they yield to their request, whilst they denounce those who refuse to comply with their importunities as foes to Christ and His holy Gospel. They contrive to obtain testamentary devices to the injury (in many cases) of widows and orphans; they condescend to flatter the female sex until they have begged all that they are able to bestow. Thus by the instrumentality of those clerical beggars, and by the cause of Christ being made a pander, the Church becomes wealthy; and wealth creates power, and power, tyranny and oppression. That many of the

clergymen of the day possess an aspiring spirit is evident from the several attempts they have made to get some of their institutions incorporated by civil authority. If a few of the most numerous denominations in the United States were to unite, join their funds, in one, and could succeed in obtaining an incorporation act, they would not only be extremely wealthy already; but they might also increase in wealth to such a degree as would endanger our civil as well as ecclesiastical liberty. But if it be asked in what manner this could be effected, I answer: In various ways, as, for instance, such a gigantic body might by means of their wealth establish so great a number of printing-offices as would enable them to print and sell Bibles at so reduced a price that they would engross the sales of all the Bibles wanted in America, which would be an annual revenue of millions. They would be enabled to educate thousands for the ministry who otherwise had no inclination to embark in that office; and they, tutored in the principles of aristocracy, and the churches filled with them, those principles might be disseminated among millions; they could also supply the most of the common schools with their teachers, and thus the rising generation would imbibe the same pernicious principles, until at length persons of this description would occupy all the civil offices in our country, which would ultimately effect the destruction of civil liberty. In a similar manner the Roman Church became elevated above the State. By testamentary devises from the people, as well as from noblemen and kings, by the sales of indulgences and other inventions, the Church became exceedingly wealthy; cloisters were erected, and they occupied by friars and nuns supported at the expense of the people, it was their interest to support the power and dignity of the Roman pontiff. The same causes will produce the same effects. If the Church should ever acquire great wealth, aspiring priests will grasp great power. Whereas this body know these things, and wish to preserve both spiritual and civil liberty, and to prevent their successors from attempting to blend the Church with the State, they have by this article prohibited an incorporation of this body, and of any theological seminary under their care, and from accumulating funds for the support of such a seminary and of missionaries."

(1853, 27.)

**119. Establishment of Seminaries Discouraged.** — Tennessee did not only oppose the incorporation of seminaries, but, strangely enough, never did encourage the establishment of any kind of theological school whatever. According to their views, theological and literary schools, supported by the Church, were superfluous, since the languages might be studied in the secular academies of the country, and a course of theology could be pursued with some able divine. The Fifth Article of the Tennessee Constitution provides: "Neither shall they have any particular treasury for the purpose of supporting . . . theological seminaries." (1853, 26.) The "Remarks" appended to this article explain: "Although this body shall have no incorporated theological seminary under their care, nor any particular treasury for its support, nevertheless they consider it highly beneficial to the Church for every minister to understand the original tongues of the Scriptures, and to be well skilled in theology. But such qualifications may be acquired without an incorporated theological seminary. There are already a goodly number of academies dispersed throughout our country which are not under the care of any particular denomination, in which the student may acquire a classical education. He, in like manner, may have the opportunity of studying theology with some able divine." (1853, 26.) However, though Tennessee in no way encouraged the establishment of a theological seminary, the conclusion must not be drawn that they underestimated or despised a well-educated ministry. The minutes of 1821 record: "A motion was made by Rev. David Henkel that no person shall be ordained a pastor of our Church unless he understands as much of the Greek language as will enable him to translate the New Testament. But no resolution respecting it was passed. It remains postponed until the next Synod, when it shall be taken into contemplation." (1821, 8.) In 1827 Tennessee made the following recommendations and declarations with respect to the German, Greek, and Hebrew languages: "Whereas the Symbolical Books of our Church, particularly Luther's works, are extant in the German language, and as sundry extracts have been made out of them, and most erroneously translated into the English; and as it is probable that such frauds may be practised in future, this body recommend the study of the German language to all

the members of the Church. This would enable them to detect the glaring frauds practised by men under the garb of Lutherans. It was resolved that a more strict attention shall be paid to the literary qualifications of those who enter the ministry than has been done heretofore. A deacon should at least understand the language in which he officiates with some degree of accuracy, and be able to make the logical compositions in writing. A pastor ought, in addition to these qualifications, be acquainted with the Greek, the original tongue of the New Testament. Also an acquaintance with the Hebrew, the original tongue of the Old Testament, would the more amply qualify him for the sacred ministry. The Synod, however, do not think that there are not also useful men in the ministry who do not possess all those qualifications. For there are men whose manifold experience supplies some literary defects. But when a whole body of ministers are illiterate, they are not able to defend the truth of the Gospel against the subtle attacks of enemies. Suppose false teachers were to make a spurious translation of the Scriptures, how could such an illiterate body of ministers detect the forgery? If the knowledge of the original tongues should ever become extinct, the Gospel might soon become forged and corrupted. It is to be lamented that there are too many young men who wish to be ministers; notwithstanding, they are too indolent to acquire a knowledge of the original tongues. They are infatuated to think that they are immediately inspired from heaven, and that, therefore, they need no literary qualifications. In order to check this growing evil, and to oppose this fanaticism, it was resolved that every candidate for the ministry shall stand a literary as well as a theological examination, and be promoted agreeably to his industry. This resolution principally respects young men." (11.)

#### 120. General Mission Treasury Regarded Dangerous.

— The Report of 1824 records: "Synod has not, and does not want to have, a treasury to pay traveling missionaries." (8.) The "Remarks" appended to the Fifth Article of the constitution, rejecting "any particular treasury for the purpose of supporting missionaries and theological seminaries," explain as follows: "There are but few, if any, young men in our country

who are not able to defray the expenses of their education either by means of their property or industry. Yet if there be such whose indolence is the cause why they are not able to defray the expenses of their education, they should by no means embark in the ministry, as the faithful discharge of ministerial duties requires men of great industry. It must also be observed that this article does not limit the charities of liberal Christians who wish to encourage the promulgation of the Gospel; for they may, if they deem it expedient, assist any student in getting his education, or any indigent congregation in getting ministerial labors. Nor does it prohibit individual congregations from having funds under their own care, for the purpose of defraying their own expenses, and assisting any of their indigent brethren. It would be expedient for every congregation to have a fund, yet by no means to hold such under an act of incorporation. Again, although this article prohibits this body from having any particular treasury for the purpose of supporting missionaries, yet some of the ministers of this body annually perform missionary labors. Now if it be asked how they are supported, it may again be asked, How were the apostles of Christ supported when they went into all the world to preach the Gospel? Did Christ recommend the establishment of a general fund by begging donations, and obtaining testamentary devises from dying men to remunerate His apostles for missionary labors? By no means. He said unto them that they should 'first seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness,' and that 'all these things should be added unto them.' Matt. 6, 33. See also vv. 25—31. Thus they had the promise of being supported whilst they labored in the Lord's vineyard. Every faithful minister may rely upon these promises. If he be industrious in preaching the Gospel and instructing the ignorant, he will turn many unto righteousness, who will consider it their duty and privilege to manifest their gratitude in contributing towards his support. But such people as manifest an avaricious disposition, so that they will suffer faithful ministers to serve them without contributing something towards their support, prove themselves unworthy of the Gospel, and minister to others, who will receive them with gratitude." (1853, 26.) In their "Objections" to the con-

stitution of the General Synod, Tennessee declared: "We cannot conceive the propriety of paying missionaries out of a general fund. How many pious ministers heretofore have preached the Gospel in remote parts, without such a provision. Men who are commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel, 'take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed?' Matt. 6, 31—34. Their daily employment is to teach and admonish the people—for their support they depend on the faithful promise of our Lord who said: 'All these things shall be added unto you.' Men who are sent of God shall profit the people; the Lord, therefore, who feeds the winged songsters, though they toil not, and arrays the lilies of the field, stirreth up the hearts of the people, and fills them with gratitude, so that they freely honor Him with their substance in supporting His ministers. Thus the promise of Christ shall evermore be verified. But hirelings and wolves do not believe this promise. They are either entangled with some temporal employment to secure their support, or else must know what they are to have from a general fund before they go forth to labor in the Lord's vineyard. When men know what they shall get from a general fund, before they preach, they have no need to exercise faith in the promise of Christ, for their trust is in the general fund! The country is already filled with such hired circuit-riders, whose trust for a support is not in the promise of our Lord; because they first bargain with their superiors or general synods what they are to have per month or year from the general fund. Was the mission of the primitive apostles conducted in this manner? Had Christ established a general treasury, out of which He had hired His apostles by the month or year? No. Is it not degrading for Christians to depart so far from the paths of Christ and His apostles? Is it not enough that we have His promise? Genuine ministers have no need of a general fund to support them; their mission is profitable to the people, whose hearts, being moved by the Lord, will support their teachers—but such men, who are not called of God do not profit the people; they therefore do not expect to be supported by the promise of Christ, hence they must look to the general treasury. What is better calculated to induce hirelings

to enter into the holy orders than their sure wages, by a general fund?" (1821, 31.) The German Report of 1821 concludes these remarks as follows: "Give an itinerant preacher 40 to 50 dollars a month, as some already receive, and it will prove to be a veritable bait to lead all manner of evil men into the ministry, whether they are called of God or not; for the salary calls them!" (28.)

**121. Funds for Widows and Orphans of Pastors Denounced.** — Regarding Christian benevolence and charity, Tennessee admonished the Christians to be liberal, and also to establish a congregational treasury to meet their needs. General treasuries, however, were denounced as leading to synodical tyranny and worldly-mindedness. This was applied also to the establishment of general funds for the support of widows and orphans of pastors. In the Report of 1821 we read: "Why are ministers' widows and orphans, and poor ministers only, to be supported by a general fund, and not also the poor members of the church? Are the families of ministers a nobler race than other people, so that extraordinary provisions must be made for them in preference to others? Would it not be better if every congregation had a fund of its own to support their needy at home? Each congregation are best acquainted with their own poor, and know who deserves help. Is it necessary that the congregations should send their money several hundred miles from home, into the general fund, and that the poor should receive it from thence? Pious ministers accustom their families to honest labor, so that they may know how to support themselves when they need it. Who supports the people's widows and orphans? It is too lamentable a fact that too many ministers do not accustom their children to labor, but indulge them in their pride, vanity, indolence, and in the imitation of rich, proud, and pompous people of the world. Behold how many ministers with their wives, in our time, surpassing humility — how grand their attire, how lofty their appearance, how great their association with the wealthy of this world! With what contempt do they view the poor! How numerous their waiters, and how little do they expose themselves to preach the Gospel unto the poor! There is no similarity between them and Christ, whose ministers they affect

to be — for He was poor; He appeared lowly and in the form of a servant. Such vain, arrogant, and indolent families truly cannot support themselves in such style after their fathers' decease; a general treasury indeed might be considered necessary to support such in their vanity. The farmers and mechanics may labor hard to procure money to fill this treasury, of which, though, their widows and orphans in their straits could expect no assistance. Have we any nobility in America whom the people must bear upon their hands? What a constant tax is hereby imposed upon the congregations! How frequently the ministers or church-council must admonish the people to cast their mites into the general fund, lest it should be exhausted! There would be no end to begging and expostulating with the people for money. Howbeit, it is said that no person is compelled to contribute towards the general fund. We grant it in one sense, but not in another; for such as did not freely contribute would be viewed with a contemptible eye, and frequently reproved as avaricious, hardened wretches, so that at last they would find themselves obliged to contribute. Such widows and orphans who by some misfortune are rendered unable to support themselves generally find benefactors, in addition to those means civil government hath already provided." (33.) The "Remarks" to the Third Article of the constitution conclude as follows: "Can it be believed that the majority of the clergy of the day are true shepherds? and that they do not cherish the most aspiring views? Why are there so many attempts made to identify the Church with the State? Why are so many petitions sent to legislative bodies for incorporation? Why is there such an insatiable thirst for creating funds of immense sums for churches under incorporation acts, if the clergy of the day did not cherish the most aspiring views, and did not wish to acquire a spiritual dominion blended with civil power?" (1853, 24.) It was in keeping with these views on general funds when Tennessee, in 1841, resolved not to participate in the Lutheran centenary jubilee advocated by the General Synod, also for the reason that they were opposed to the plan of collecting \$150,000 as an endowment fund for its literary and other institutions. (15.)

**122. Doctrinal Peculiarities.** — Evidently at the time of its organization, the views prevailing in the Tennessee Synod concerning "The Last Things" were not as yet sufficiently clarified. They believed that by the organization of the General Synod the way was prepared for "the great falling away," spoken of in the Bible, when "the *Antichrist* prophesied 2 Thess. 2 would set himself in the temple of God." In the "Conclusion" of his "Objections" to the constitution of the General Synod, David Henkel said: "We do not expect finally to prevent the establishment of this General Synod by publishing our objections, because we believe, agreeably to the divine predictions, that the great falling away is approaching, so that Antichrist will set himself into the temple of God. 2 Thess. 2. We also believe that the establishment of General Synods are preparing the way for him. Antichrist will not, nor cannot, get into power without a general union, which is not effected by a divine harmony of godly doctrines, but by common temporal interests and the power of a majority. Notwithstanding, we consider it our duty to make the people attentive to those things, and to instruct such as are not wilfully blind. But should we be deceived in our opinion, and clearly be convinced of it, we shall not be ashamed to recant. In vain people dream of the Millennium before crosses and tribulations shall have visited the Christian world by the rage of Antichrist. His kingdom is reared under a good garb; if this were not the case, no person would be deceived. Men who are notoriously immoral and vicious cannot deceive, but they only who appear like innocent lambs. May God preserve all His people against every temptation, for Jesus' sake! Amen." (1821, 35.) In a letter of Jacob Larros, appended to the German Report of 1821, we read: "O that our dear brethren in office would recognize the prophecies of Holy Writ concerning the kingdom of Antichrist which . . . soon will undergo a great change and appear in its highest stage; for then they would be on their guard. Of him it is written: 'And it was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him.' He desires a universal communion (Universalgemeinschaft) to reach his

purpose. This he neither can nor denies to attain by [bringing them all into] agreement with the Scriptures, but by the majority of votes. Oh, how it will grieve our brethren when they, having by their well-meant *Planentwurf* [constitution of the General Synod] organized a universal communion, behold that, as forerunners, they have only prepared the way for Anti-christ to reach his goal and obtain his dominion. From this, Lord God, preserve our Church and our dear brethren in the ministry! Amen." (36.) — Concerning the *ministry* the Sixth Article of the constitution, adopted 1828, declares: "The grades of the ministry are two: pastor and deacon, or, as St. Paul calls them, bishop and deacon. They must possess the qualifications which are described by St. Paul 1 Tim. 3, 1—14; Titus 1, 4—9." (1853, 25.) Both of these offices, as well as ordination, were regarded as necessary. Says the Report of 1820: "As concerning the states and grades of the ministry (des Lehramts), we do not recognize more than two, to wit, pastor and deacon, as necessary for the preservation and propagation of the Church. A pastor is an evangelical teacher who discharges the office fully, in all its parts, or who performs all ministerial acts. He must be ordained and consecrated to this office by prayer and the imposition of hands by one or more pastors, when he also solemnly promises faithfully to discharge such office according to the Word of God and the doctrine of our Church. A deacon is indeed also a minister of the Word of God, but he does not discharge this office fully, like a pastor, but conducts catechetical instruction, reads sermons, conducts funerals, exhorts and, in the absence of a pastor, also baptizes children, where such is desired. He must be a regular member of the church and possess the testimony of a Christian conversation. At the request of the church-council he is to be examined at the synod as to his qualifications. If he is found able, he is dedicated [gewidmet] to such service by one or more pastors by prayer and laying on of hands either at the conference or in one of the congregations which he serves. And in the presence of the whole congregation he is, at the same time, to make the solemn promise that he will faithfully discharge his office according to his instructions. If such a deacon proves to be diligent in his office and acquires the knowledge

and ability needed for the discharge of the office of a pastor, and also receives a regular call from one or more congregations who are without a minister, he may be consecrated and ordained a pastor in the manner indicated before." (1820, 6.) — In the *celebration of the Lord's Supper* the Tennessee Synod adhered to the custom of breaking the bread, instead of using wafers. When questioned by Missouri concerning this practise, they appealed to 1 Cor. 10, 16 and to passages of the Confessions which speak of a "breaking of the bread." In 1856 Synod declared: "With all due deference to the learning and high character of the Missouri Synod for orthodoxy, we have been unable to see sufficient reason to make any change in our manner of administering the Lord's Supper. We are influenced in our practise in this respect by the authority of both the Holy Scriptures and the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. . . . For the present, therefore, we feel fully justified in our present practise." (R. 1856, 23 f.) Self-evidently, Tennessee did not adhere to this practise in the interest of Reformed or unionistic views.

### THE HENKELS.

**123. A Most Influential Family.** — The Henkels were by far the most prominent and influential of the men composing the Tennessee Synod. Because of their bold and uncompromising attitude toward the sects as well as all others deviating from the Christian doctrine, as taught by the Lutheran Confessions, they, together with their adherents, were universally, by false Lutherans as well as Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and other sects, hated and ostracized, and stigmatized as "the Henkelites," Paul Henkel being designated as their "head." (B. 1824, 10.) The sire of the American branch of the Henkel family was Gerhard Henkel. For a time he was court chaplain to the Duke Moritz of Saxony. But when the duke turned Roman Catholic, Henkel was banished. He left for America and served the first Lutherans in Virginia and later on Lutheran congregations in Pennsylvania, notably in New Hanover and Germantown. James Henkel, the grandson of G. Henkel, was the father of Moses, Paul, Isaac, and John Henkel. Thus Paul Henkel, born 1754, was the great-grandson

of Gerhard Henkel. He was educated by J. A. Krug and ordained by the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1792. For many years he served as missionary, laboring especially in Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio. He was pastor at New Market, Va., at Salisbury, Va., and again at New Market, where he died, November 17, 1825. He participated in the organization of the North Carolina Synod, in 1803, of the Ohio Synod, in 1818, of the Tennessee Synod, in 1820. In New Market, Paul Henkel, together with his sons, established a printery for the purpose of supplying the Lutheran Church with the books, German and English, which they were in need of so sorely: Luther's Catechism, the Augsburg Confession, a Liturgy, hymn-books, etc. Paul Henkel was the father of six sons: Solomon, Philip, Ambrose, Andrew, David, and Carl. Solomon was a physician, and manager of the printing-establishment. Philip was pastor in Green County, Tenn., and a member of the North Carolina Synod. Together with Bell, who was later ordained a minister, he opened a Union Seminary which, however, soon passed out of existence. He was one of the founders of the Tennessee Synod. Two of his sons, Irenaeus and Eusebius, were Lutheran ministers. Ambrose was minister at New Market, and a member of the New Market publishing firm. Under him the Book of Concord and other important works were issued. He was joint translator of the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smaleald Articles, the Appendix, and the Articles of Visitation. Andrew, the fourth son, was pastor in Ohio. David, the fifth son, was the most gifted of the Henkel family. A clear, able, and undaunted theologian, he was preeminent in zealously defending the Lutheran truth. He died 1831, at the early age of thirty-six years. His two sons, Polycarp and Socrates, entered the ministry. The latter was pastor in New Market for more than forty years; he also assisted in the publication of the Book of Concord. Charles, the youngest son, was pastor in Ohio and published a translation of the Augsburg Confession in 1834. Dr. Graebner remarks with respect to the publishing house established by the Henkels at New Market: "From this printery, which is in existence to-day as the oldest Lutheran publishing house in America, were issued numerous large and small publications in both the English and German languages,

abc-books, catechisms, hymnals, theological dissertations and polemical writings, books for pastime and for instruction for young and old, Christmas booklets, such as *Das Virginische Kinderbuch* of 1809, a paper entitled, *Der Virginische Volksberichter und Neu-Marketer Wochenschrift* bearing the motto: 'Ich bring' das Neu's, So gut ich's weiss!' The Henkels were a busy and skilful people. When in need of manuscript for their press, they wrote it; when in need of verses, they composed them; when in need of wood-cuts, they cut in wood; after the books were printed, they bound them; and when the bindings had dried, they, in part themselves, canvassed the finished product throughout the country." (611.)

**124. Paul Henkel.** — "My father," says Andrew Henkel, "was a large man, within half an inch of six feet in height, well developed, with a keen black eye, as erect as an Indian; somewhat inclined to corpulency, and yet athletic and rapid in his movements. Though his health was not always good, yet he was almost constantly employed either in reading, writing, preaching, or traveling; and when necessary he did not hesitate to labor with his hands. He had no desire for this world's goods beyond what was wanting for daily use; whatever savored of ostentation was foreign to his nature. His manner of living was frugal, and his dress plain, and yet in performing the services of the sanctuary, he uniformly wore a gown of rich black silk. He had great equanimity and serenity of temper, and his friendships were sincere and constant, and his friends numerous. In the social circle he always rendered himself agreeable, and often communicated important instruction by means of some pertinent and, sometimes, humorous anecdote. As a preacher he possessed much more than ordinary power. In the commencement of his discourse he was slow and somewhat blundering, but, as his subject opened before him, he would become animated and eloquent, with a full flow of appropriate thought and glowing language. His illustrations were lucid and forceful, simple and natural. He assisted in training a goodly number of young men for the ministry, some of whom have occupied responsible stations with great fidelity and usefulness." (Sheatsley, *History*, 40; *L. u. W.* 43, 106 ff.) The obituary notice of "Father Paul

Henkel of blessed memory," appended to the Tennessee Report of 1826, says, in part: "During his illness his greatest concern was that we might all remain faithful to the pure Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, and with meekness and patience, yet manfully contend for the truth for which he had contended so earnestly." (B. 1825, 16.) He expressed the same sentiments in a message to Pastor Riemenschneider, by whom he also desired to be buried. Ambrose Henkel, in a letter, dated November 30, 1825, reports concerning the death of his father: "I then asked him whether I should inform also all my brothers to this effect concerning him. He said: 'O yes; write to all of them, that by all means they should remain steadfast.' I furthermore asked him whether he still stood on the faith which he had hitherto defended. He said: 'Yes, indeed; on this faith I have lived, and on it I will now die.' I was also careful to call in several neighbors to listen to his words, fearing that enemies might contradict my report of his statements." In his last letter, written to his son David, and dated August 20, 1825, Paul Henkel wrote: "If the doctrine is right and it is the will of the Lord that it should be taught publicly, He will also find and show ways and means to do it. . . . How our mendax-priests would rejoice if they could accuse some of us that we deviated in a single article from the teaching of the Augsburg Confession of Faith." (L. u. W. 60, 62.)

**125. David and Philip Henkel.**—As for David Henkel, the Report of 1831 enumerates his publications and speaks of him as "this much-esteemed and venerable fellow-laborer." "His last illness," says the notice of his death, "was dyspepsia, which disabled him from officiating in a public capacity for the term of nine months. He bore his afflictions with a perfect resignation to the will of his divine Redeemer. He embarked in the cause of his blessed Savior when a youth (1812). And we are happy to say, to the praise of this worthy servant of Christ, that his assiduity and vigilance to study and deep researches into the truth of divine revelation have seldom been equaled by any. He remained immovable in the doctrines he promulgated to the end of his life. This venerable servant of the Lord had to endure many trials, crosses, and temptations, but he maintained his integrity through them all, trusting to

the promises of his Redeemer; and notwithstanding the difficulties he had to encounter, he left a bright example to succeeding pilgrims. His ardent desire for the promotion of his Redeemer's kingdom and his love of truth caused him to submit cheerfully to the difficulties connected with his official labors. When on his death-bed, being interrogated by his friends whether he still remained steadfast in the doctrines which he had taught, he confidently answered in the affirmative. Being again asked whether he feared death, he replied in the negative. The last words which he was heard to utter, were, 'O Lord Jesus, Thou Son of God, receive my spirit!' and in a few moments expired." "The perishable remains of this worthy brother were followed to the grave by his loving companion and seven children, together with a numerous train of mourners, who were left to lament the loss of a kind father, an affectionate husband, a friend and benefactor. The body is deposited at St. John's Church, Lincoln County, N. C. The funeral sermon was delivered by the Rev. Daniel Moser, from Phil. 1, 21: 'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.' From 1812 to 1830 David Henkel preached 3,200 sermons, baptized 2,997 infants and 243 adults, and confirmed 1,105 persons. The whole course of his ministry was distinguished for industry and perseverance. He traveled in all seasons, even the most inclement, and frequently preached two and three times in a day, in the German and English languages. Besides, he maintained an extensive correspondence and was quite active also in a literary way. (1831, 15.) — Concerning Philip Henkel we read in the obituary notice, appended to the Tennessee Report of 1833: "Already in his youth he was a confessor and defender of the Christian religion, and began in 1800 to consecrate his services to the Lord, in whose vineyard he labored incessantly for 33 years and 3 months. During this time he preached 4,350 sermons, of which 125 were funeral sermons. He baptized 4,115 children and 325 adults, and confirmed 1,650 persons into the Christian Church. . . . Shortly before his end he declared, if it were the will of God to take him home, he was willing, and prayed the verse, which were also the last words he was heard to utter: 'For me to live is

Jesus, To die is gain for me, To Him I gladly yield me, And die right cheerfully.’’ (B. 1833, 24.) Philip Henkel was first to conceive the plan of organizing the Tennessee Synod. In a letter to his brother David, dated December 9, 1819, he wrote that he would do his utmost to induce Pastors Zink and Miller to join them. “But,” he added, “do not say a word of it to anybody, not even to your best friend, lest they get wind of it.” In a second letter, dated March 14, 1820, Philip declared: “If the old ministers will not act agreeably to the Augsburg Confession, we will erect a synod in Tennessee.” (L. u. W. 59, 481.)

THE END OF VOLUME I.

---

1012 00040 4196

1 1012 00040 4196